

Tragicall Historie and Phantasticall Trifles:
On Evaluation of the Book in Sixteenth-Century
Translators' Paratexts

Sirkku Ruokkeinen

MA Thesis

University of Turku

School of Languages and Translation Studies

English; English Philology

April 2013

TURUN YLIOPISTO

Kieli- ja käännöstieteiden laitos / Humanistinen tiedekunta

RUOKKEINEN, SIRKKU: *Tragicall Historie and Phantasticall Trifles: On Evaluation of the Book in Sixteenth-Century Translators' Paratexts*

Pro gradu-tutkielma, 88 s., 18 liites.

Englantilainen filologia

Huhtikuu 2013

Tässä tutkielmassa tarkastelen kirjoihin ja kirjallisuuteen kohdistuvaa arvottavaa kieltä 1500-luvun Britanniassa. Tutkielman tavoitteena on selvittää, millaisia positiivisia ja negatiivisia evaluaatioita esiintyy kääntäjien parateksteissä ja mitä nämä ilmaukset kertovat kirjan arvostuksesta aikalaisyhteiskunnassa.

Genetten mukaan paratekstien tarkoitus on paitsi antaa lukijalle informaatiota tekstistä, myös ohjata teoksen luentaa ja vaikuttaa tekstin tarjoaman tulkinnan vastaanottoon. Tutkielman materiaalina käytettyjä kuuttatoista paratekstiä, tarkemmin sanottuna prologia tai dedikaatiota, on lähestytty lähiluennan kautta. Luennassa keskityttiin ilmauksiin, joilla tuodaan esiin kirjoihin ja kirjallisuuteen liittyviä asenteita ja arvotuksia. Näin kerätyt evaluoivat ilmaukset analysoin Martinin ja Whiten kehittämän, systeemis-funktionaalisen kieliopin tutkimusperinteestä syntyneen Appraisal Framework-mallin avulla. Tämän teoreettisen viitekehyksen etuna on leksikaalinen lähestymistapa, joka verrattuna muihin arvottavaa kieltä pääasiallisesti kieliopillisista näkökulmista kartoittaviin teorioihin kattaa suuremaan esiintymäkentän.

Analyysin alussa materiaalin evaluaatiota käsittelevät ilmaukset jaetaan kahteen ryhmään: kirjaa arvottavat sekä kirjan tekijöitä ja taustahahmoja, tavallisesti kirjailijaa ja kääntäjää, arvottavat ilmaukset. Tutkimuksen perusteella voidaan todeta että kirjaa ja kirjailijaa arvottavista ilmauksista tyypillisimpiä ovat paratekstin genrevaatimusten sanelemat positiivisen evaluaation ilmaukset. Kirjaa evaluoidaan muun muassa tyylin, sisällön ja tekstin vaikutusten osalta. Käännöstä ja kääntäjää evaluoivien ilmausten havaittiin muodostavan oman ryhmänsä, jossa tyypillisin evaluoiva ilmaus on eksplisiittisen kielteinen, mutta jossa myös esiintyy positiivisia ilmauksia. Käännökseen ja kääntäjään kohdistuvaa positiivista evaluaatiota esiintyy implisiittisessä, ideationaaliseen viestiin nojaavassa diskurssissa. Lukijalle tarjotaan kahta eri evaluatiivista viestiä. Tästä johtuen tutkielmassa katsotaan, että kirjaan kohdistuva evaluaatio on olevan pääasiallisesti epäluotettavaa, ja että hedelmällisimmät tulokset tutkiessa aikalaissäityksiä kirjallisuudesta on löydettävissä implisiittisistä- sekä kiertoilmauksista.

Asiasanat: kriittinen diskurssianalyysi, englannin kieli, arviointi, arvostus, kirjahistoria, paratekstit, käännökset, systeemis-funktionaalinen kielioppi

Table of contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Paratexts	3
2.1. Preliminaries to paratext study	6
2.1.1. Prologue	7
2.1.2. Dedication	9
2.2. The sixteenth-century translators' prologue and dedication	10
2.3. Paratexts in the sixteenth century: Context of production	14
3. Devices of evaluation	17
3.1. Introduction to Appraisal Framework	19
3.1.1. Attitude	21
3.1.1.1. Affect	22
3.1.1.2. Judgment	23
3.1.1.3. Appreciation	27
3.1.2. Graduation and Engagement	28
3.2. Positioning: Functions of Appraisal	30
4. Material and method	33
5. Analysis and discussion	37
5.1. Evaluation of the book	38
5.1.1. The main text as a whole	39
5.1.2. Individual features of the book	42
5.1.3. The translation	51
5.2. Evaluation of the actors within paratext	62
5.2.1. Author	63
5.2.2. Translator	69
5.3. Discussion	75
6. Conclusion	81
Bibliography	83
Appendices	
Finnish summary	

List of figures and tables

Table 1.	Subtypes of Appraisal.....	19
Table 2.	Categories of Attitude.....	21
Table 3.	Primary material.....	34

List of abbreviations

AF	The Appraisal Framework
<i>CCP</i>	<i>Corpus of 16th Century Paratexts</i>
EEBO	Early English Books Online
MT	Modesty topos
<i>OED</i>	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>
SFL	Systemic functional linguistics
STC	Short Title Catalogue (number)
TCP	Text Creation Partnership

List of symbols (In primary material only)

{ }	Expanded abbreviation
[]	<i>CCP</i> addition or change to EEBO TCP transcription

1. Introduction

The printing press in its classic form came to be in the mid-fifteenth century as the German printer Johann Gutenberg combined some pre-existing inventions with innovative designs of his own. The success of this device ensured that by the end of the fifteenth century, the first English printers began their work in London. The British industry was slow to develop at first, but after the initial difficulties the expansion of book production was extremely rapid and heralded a great variety of changes. The most immediate and noticeable of these changes were the reduction in the price of books and the rise of the profession of printers, giving larger groups of people access to literary texts. Other changes appeared more intangible at first: the effects on the spread of humanism and Reformation, the speculative trade of books and slow abandonment of the system of patronage, and a growing interest in what the public was reading (Binns 1996: 4-5; Brayman Hackel 2005: 82-88; Eisenstein [1979] 1980; Febvre and Martin 2010: 262-332; Hellinga 2007: 211-212; Steinberg 1996: 57).

The purpose of this thesis is to study the English expressions of evaluation and appreciation of the book after this technological and cultural shift. It is generally assumed that the sixteenth century saw a multitude of discussions over the characteristics of good reading material, and that there would have been ways to convey this “prescriptive reading” suggested to the reader (Brayman Hackel 2005: 70). Few studies were found to support or contradict the assumption, despite the widely known fact that attitudes towards books and reading were rather authoritarian during the latter part of Renaissance (see e.g. Brayman Hackel 2005: 72-76; Thomas 1969).

The attitudes towards the book are perhaps best visible in *paratexts*. The term refers to all textual material offering information of the text to the reader, such as titles, tables of contents, indexes, prologues, blurbs, and advertisements (Genette 1997). Paratexts have the dual purpose of signposting the content to the reader by giving information on what to expect and what they commit to by engaging with the text,

and shaping the interpretation of the work by giving direction to the reader's attention.

The paratexts studied here are translators' *prologues* and *dedications*. These are usually the lengthiest items of paratext, appearing in the very beginning or end of the publication. They are flexible in terms of their contents, giving the writer great influence in directing the readers' attention. Translators' paratexts were chosen as the material of this study because translators may be seen as reproducing previously existing materials, and it is assumed that the translators would have been motivated to justify their choices by using evaluative language in their paratexts. My research questions are as follow:

1. How is positive and negative evaluation of the book accomplished in sixteenth-century translators' paratexts?
2. What do the evaluations reveal about the contemporary attitudes towards the book?

These questions are answered here through systematic collection, cataloguing, and qualitative analysis of textual items conveying evaluative language in sixteenth-century translators' paratexts. The material studied consists of sixteen prologues and dedications chosen from the *Corpus of Sixteenth-Century Paratexts (CCP)*, a collection of 86 paratexts published in the sixteenth-century England (CCP 2012). These paratexts were subjected to a close reading using the *Appraisal Framework (AF)*, established by J. R. Martin and P. R. R. White to analyze the evaluative language discussing the book (Martin [2000] 2001; Martin and White 2005; White 2001a). The AF focuses on the description of expressions conveying emotion, evaluation or opinion.

This thesis is organized in the following manner. Chapter 2 will concentrate on Genette's paradigm of paratexts, after which an account of the relevant areas of Appraisal Framework will be given in chapter 3. The primary texts will be presented in chapter 4, followed by the analysis and discussion in chapter 5. Chapter 6 will conclude the thesis.

2. Paratexts

When a reader approaches a text, they often already have a grasp of the material they are about to read. The entry to the text is not as straightforward as merely opening a book. Rather, most readers would know beforehand the title, author, and topic of the work, and sometimes even something of the style, structure and contents of the book they are about to read. This understanding is achieved through paratexts.

The term paratext is attributed to Gerard Genette, whose work *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* (1997) deals with the structures and hierarchies of textual matter surrounding a publication, and their influence over the readers' interpretation. Paratext signifies any textual element providing a point of entry to the text. All textual elements connected to the primary text – such as title pages, covers, errata, headings, prologues, epilogues and dedications, and even texts outside the book, such as advertisements, reviews or other books – are paratexts. The reader uses these texts to decide whether or not to commit to the reading of the book.

Genette does pioneering work in offering a “global view of the liminal mediations and the logic of their relation to the reading public” (Macksey 1997: xx). His systematic overview of the paratextual matter, as well as his analysis of the paratexts' necessity for the literary culture, has revealed grievously neglected areas of study. For although some paratexts have long been a topic of study, they have not been seen as a part of a paradigm. For example the dedication has been studied by scholars such as Janson (1964) in connection to the classics translated or republished in the sixteenth century, and Williams (1962: ix-xii), who gives a brief but lucid description of the dedicatory texts before the 1640s as a part of his index. More recently, Litzler (2011) has focused on medical prologues, whereas Saenger's (2006) publication covers the whole of English Renaissance front matter. These studies only briefly touch upon Genette's work (Litzler 2011: 16, 17n; Saenger 2006: 15n). Close readings of the paratextual matter have concentrated on issues such as historical advertising, editorial principles, or the philosophy of translating (Massai 2011; Hermans 1985: 103-135; Voss 1998). Although enlightening, these studies often

disregard what Genette (1997: 10-13) has stated as the main purpose of paratexts: the influence which the paratext wields over the reader in the interpretation of the work.

The paratextual device exists to persuade the reader to adopt a point of view; to read the text properly and to accept the reading (Genette 1997: 197). The notion of studying paratexts as a device of presenting an interpretation, as a device of persuasion, influence, and even manipulation, has gained only limited attention (see e.g. Brayman Hackel 2005; Day 2011: 34; Genette 1997: 409; Hiltunen 2012). One of the parallel fields of research is the study of marketing and advertising in the early printed paratexts (e.g. Saenger 2006; Voss 1998). As Saenger (2006: 3) notes, “the pages of front matter, if viewed in the context of the book market, can be seen as a particularly accurate contemporary sliding edge between the text and the world.” This marketing-based point of view is founded on the dichotomy between the literary work as art and as a product, and the reflections of this conflict in the paratextual device during the Renaissance. The study of the forms of persuasion and influence on the reader is vital in understanding the contemporary views of the text. Armstrong (2007: 40-41) also recognizes this view by noting that “[a]n analysis of the paratext can thus be an invaluable key to understanding the reception of a particular author by revealing contemporary perceptions of his or her status.” Hence these texts provide an ideal opportunity to observe the sixteenth-century views on the text.

Genette (1997), however, has excluded the historical viewpoint from his study. He has concentrated on the modern English and French text, ignoring the complications to his taxonomy created by the multitude of forms the book has gone through (Macksey 1997: xx; Saenger 2006: 15n). In the introduction to *Paratexts*, he acknowledges the development the book has gone through in its history:

The ways and means of the paratext change continually, depending on period, culture, genre, author, work, and edition, with varying degrees of pressure, sometimes widely varying: it is an acknowledged fact that our “media” age has seen the proliferation of a type of discourse around texts that was unknown in the classical world and a fortiori in antiquity and the Middle Ages[.]

(Genette 1997: 3)

This acknowledgement of a gap in his paradigm has been addressed by some recent studies into historical paratext. For example, Binns (1996: 5) notes that “Genette’s remarks on paratext [...] are very relevant to Anglo-Latin texts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries – indeed, such texts modify and enrich his argument considerably.” It is the early printing practices which formed the modern paratextual apparatus, and the foundation of Genette’s paradigm (Sherman 2007: 68). Disregarding Genette’s focus on modern era and applying his paradigm of paratextual matter in the study of sixteenth-century texts is grounded on a degree of continuity and stability found in the central categories of paratexts.

Therefore it can be concluded that Genette’s paradigm offers a practical starting point to the study of historical evaluations of the text. However, the framework lacks a comprehensive definition of the primary text, or the body text surrounded by paratexts, the evaluation of which is the ultimate objective of the reader in consuming paratexts. Genette (1997: 3-4n) discusses this textual whole through the lexeme *text*. His use of the term *book* refers to all matter within the object, text and paratext alike. As the primary material of this study consists of translators’ paratexts, it might be functional to adopt a viewpoint in which the body text consists of all the translated material within the book. Therefore, this perspective includes paratexts by the original author within this textual body, henceforth titled the *main text*.

The application of Genette’s taxonomy to sixteenth-century material requires some attention to the historical contexts of the study as well as to the similarities between historical and modern paratext. The ways and means of evaluation in paratextual matter are influenced by the genre features of the texts surrounding them. Because of this, the genres of paratext studied here are presented in section 2.1, followed by a comparison between their historical and modern forms in section 2.2. Finally section 2.3 will give an overview of the extratextual and contextual issues influencing the sixteenth-century paratext and hence, responsible for the modern and Renaissance versions of these genres.

2.1. Preliminaries to paratext study

Paratexts are divided into two categories, according to their spatial positioning in terms of the main text. *Epitext* refers to all paratexts not in direct relation to the main text (Genette 1997: 4-5). They include items such as reviews or textual recommendations of a publication, indeed all items discussing or even mentioning the text, provided that they are situated outside the main publication. Paratexts such as prologues by editors or translators in which the writer wishes to recommend the author of the main text through mention of his other, more famous works can be viewed as epitext. Although the epitext as paratextual device was already a well-established part of the sixteenth-century book, examples of epitexts were not found in the material and are therefore not a part of this study.

The second category of paratexts is called *peritexts*. This category includes any textual matter spatially coexistent with the main text, whether longer, such as blurbs, prologues, epilogues, and dedications, or shorter, such as the titles, title pages or marginalia. In other words, peritext refers to all textual elements within the book not a part of the main text (Genette 1997: 4-5). The central purpose of both epitext and peritext is to guide the reader's attention and situate the writer in a position of authority over the interpretation of the text (*ibid.*: 10-13; Lewis 2008: 3). Epitext directs outside the publication, and peritext does the same within the book.

The two types of peritexts studied in this thesis are prologue and dedication. These two were chosen since the producer of these paratexts is relatively easy to verify. Prologue and dedication have somewhat specialized functions, and they are thus discussed in separate subsections below. The section will begin with the discussion of prologue, in 2.1.1, mainly because the paratext type was introduced first by Genette (1997), and the discussions relating to dedications rely on this exploration somewhat. This is followed by a discussion on the dedication in subsection 2.1.2. It should be noted, however, in the later sections of this thesis, dedication is discussed first so as to reflect the order of presentation of the paratexts in their original textual context.

2.1.1. Prologue

Prologue is “[t]he preface or introduction to a text; esp. a speech (usually in verse) forming the introduction to a play; a preamble, a preliminary discourse” (*OED Online*, s.v. *prologue* n.). Notable here is the placement of the prologue in front of the main text, as well as the paratextual functions pointed out. The prologue is introductory or preliminary to the main text. The contents are not given in the definition. *Epilogues* are similarly described: through paratextuality and placement (*ibid.*: s.v. *epilogue* n.).

The lexeme *preface* is frequently used as a synonym to prologue. It has a slightly more specific definition, going into the contents of the paratext: “[t]he introduction to a literary work, usually stating its subject, purpose, scope, method, etc.” (*OED Online*, s.v. *preface* n.). While prologue is the chosen term for the peritext in this thesis due to the flexibility of its definition, the preferred terminology of researches whose work has been utilized will be preserved below.

Preface is Genette’s (1997: 161-293) term of choice. His definition covers both pre- and post-facing introductory texts, viewing the *postface* (epilogue) as a subcategory. In discussing preface, Genette too begins with the placement in relation to main text. The complexity of possible situations of production is recognized in a discussion focused on individual elements influencing the paratext: time of writing, sender, placement, and form (*ibid.*: 170-195). Genette (1997: 196-293) lists six different types of prefaces and a multitude of functions. The central preface type for this thesis is the *original preface*. Here it shall be described in detail, while the other preface types are given briefly at the end of the subsection.

The most important function of the original preface is “*to ensure that the text is read properly*” (Genette 1997: 197, italics as in the original). This indicates two wishes by the author, the minimal and the maximal: that the book is read, and that it is read correctly. The other five types are the functions of conveying *importance*, *novelty/tradition*, *unity*, *truthfulness*, and the acting as a *lightning rod* (Genette 1997: 199-236). The function of *importance* is rather self-evident. The preface writer stresses the usefulness of the main text and the profit gained from the reading. The

preface also contains reference to the *novelty* or *tradition* of the topic in an attempt to draw additional value. Other original prefaces, chiefly in collections of poems or essays, express *unity* between texts, while the true objective of the author might have been simply to “clean out a drawer” (Genette 1997: 201). The fifth function, *truthfulness*, refers to author’s positive self-evaluations. While outright praise of self would be considered crass, expressions of truthful handling of the subject matter are commonplace. Lastly, the preface is sometimes expected to function as a *lightning rod*. This function of the preface is to defend against criticism. The author uses expressions of modesty, deriding himself and his skill, in order to “ward off critics, that is, to neutralize them” (Genette 1997: 207-208). Hence one of the main functions of the preface, according to Genette, is the directing of criticism elsewhere.

Genette (1997: 237-293) lists other preface types as well, such as postfaces, correcting a possibly erroneous reading, and the *later preface*, used when the paratext is written for the second (or later) edition. *Delayed preface*, which Genette (1997: 247) morbidly calls the “final preface”, can be seen in prefatory material of aging authors hoping to get the “last word”, as it were (Genette 1997: 260). *Allographic* and *actorial prefaces* are both produced by a third party – in the latter case by an actual person mentioned in the main text, whereas *fictional prefaces* are told by one of the characters of a fictional work.

In the types and definitions of prefaces we encounter the central limitation of Genette’s viewpoint in terms of this thesis. The changes the translation places upon paratext are not considered. Indeed it is one of the issues Genette has deliberately avoided (Macksey 1997: xx). Due to this avoidance, the author of the main text is seen as the only possible creator of original preface. The author is seen as “the main and, strictly speaking, the only person interested in having the book read properly” (Genette 1997: 197). However, section 2.2 will show that the functions of the original preface are quite clearly reproduced in the translator’s paratexts as well.

2.1.2. Dedication

The second relevant genre of peritexts to this thesis is the dedication. In the sixteenth-century context, the closest definition by *OED* reads: “[t]he giving up or devoting (of oneself, one's time, labour, etc.) to the service of a person or to the pursuit of a purpose.” (*OED Online*, s.v. *dedication* n.). Unlike with prologue, the central feature of this definition is neither paratextuality nor placement, but the reference to a third party, and optionally, the mention of relationships between people, work, and the discourses of reciprocity (see e.g. Binns 1996: 7).

Genette also defines dedication through an outside actor. The central feature of dedications is the offering of the book “as a token of esteem to a person” (1997: 117). Unlike prologue, dedication is a fairly unambiguous genre:

[T]he dedication, I said, is the proclamation (sincere or not) of a relationship (one kind or another) between the author and some person, group, or entity. Except for additional encroachments on the functions of the preface, the dedication's own function – which, for all that, is not unimportant – is exhausted in that proclamation.

(Genette 1997: 135-136)

Simply put, the central function of dedication is achieved through the statement of dedication. While some dedications may take on functions of the prologue, the central act is almost always completed through a single sentence or prepositional phrase (e.g. *For Samantha*). Historically, the dedicatory expressions were more varied. According to van Dam (2008: 15-16), classical texts could be dedicated through three actions: “naming a dedicatee, by presenting him the work, or by asking him for correction.” While the gifting of the work cannot be witnessed, the naming of the dedicatee, as well as request for their corrections, can be identified from most of the *CCP* dedications (2012).

Genette (1997: 117-143) further divides dedicatory genres into two according to the situation and form of the offer: while some dedicatory texts exist in all copies of the publication, added in the printing phase and published as a part of the book, others are only included in the *presentation copy*, the copy gifted to the dedicatee (*ibid.*). The practice of adding the dedication to a single copy was common in the early

printing period. Although the differences in publicity and added value between these two dedicatory practices might bring further insight to this study, the number of surviving copies of sixteenth-century texts studied is limited and the research into the numbers of copies printed and their exact peritextual devices is well beyond the scope of this thesis. It must suffice to state here that the distinction of personal and public dedication was fairly common in the sixteenth century.

Unlike prologue, dedication as a peritextual genre has already lost most of the functions it carried in the era of early printing practices. As stated above, the forms in which the modern dedications appear are relatively limited. While in the sixteenth century, the act of dedicating was similarly achieved through a single sentence, the actual peritexts were often noticeably longer than today. The functions of the early printed prologue and dedication are further explored in subsection 2.2 below.

2.2. The sixteenth-century translators' prologue and dedication

As Genette (1997: 117-143, 161-293) only approaches the contents and functions of paratexts in regards to modern and early modern works, it should be asked what types of paratexts there were before, and what messages these paratexts conveyed. Oddly few studies have gone into the contents of the early modern prologue and dedication in detail, regardless of the fact that different aspects of paratexts have been studied extensively. In one of the few studies found focused on contents of historical paratext, Litzler (2011: 15-37) summarizes the structure of the Middle English medical prologue, concluding that the trends of the genre seem to include items such as “information on the author/writer, sources, audience or reader(s), and the subject matter in question.” This definition seems acceptable, though it must be noted that it was made with genre-specific material, and limited to prologues. Binns (1996), on the other hand, concentrates on the whole of sixteenth-century paratext, although out of the paratextual genres of interest here, he only offers exact comments on dedication, noting it is a “kind of a testimonial [...] usually in letter form” (*ibid.*: 7). This subsection seeks to expand upon these definitions and make some more specific notes on the contents of the texts studied in this thesis. The discussion following is not meant as conclusive, but to work as a background contextualization

to the items discussed later. The subsection has been conducted on the basis of previous work by Hiltunen (2012) and relies on the *Corpus of Sixteenth-Century Paratexts* (CCP 2012). CCP is a relatively small corpus of 87 paratexts (or 92 000 words), containing prologues, dedications and a few epilogues.

Hiltunen (2012), who studies the CCP paratexts from the pragmatic point of view, as textual examples of persuasion, also goes into the full contents of sixteenth-century paratext. In studying texts from CCP, several reoccurring content features of the texts were recovered. Hiltunen (2012) lists the “set of building blocks” for sixteenth-century prologue as following: *Dedication/ Preface*, *The main text and author*, *Translator and translation*, *Audience*, and *Other*. The list represents the general order of arrangement in the CCP texts. The paratexts begin with a greeting of the intended audience (*Dedication/ Preface*). The most common types of greetings refer to the general reader or a specific patron. The body of the paratext (*The main text and author*) begins with a narration of the main text, naming or praising the main text or author, and with a description of the process of work. The translator might relate his method or the objectives he hopes to accomplish (*Translator and translation*). A discussion on the English language and its status is also common. At the end, the writer often returns to address the audience (*Audience*), asking for goodwill and advice in the correction of errors found within the work. The end sequence (*Other*) may contain any number of exit strategies, such as a prayer, salutation or a mere signature (Hiltunen 2012).

The entire feature set listed is rarely found from single text; one would be hard pressed to find a paratext containing all (Hiltunen 2012). One could claim consistency, however, in the beginning and end sequences often containing the most direct forms of address to the reader, as well as in the repetitive nature of some phrasal units and topoi. The occurrence of these features is frequent enough to claim that an expectation, by the contemporary reader, must have formed towards the

appropriate literary form and contents of the text. Hence it is perhaps justified to speak of the paratextual *genre* (Hiltunen 2012). The paratexts were a result of historical development and many conventionalized topoi, stemming from the classical Greek tradition (see e.g. Binns 1994; Dunn 1994: 2-5).¹ The list showing the typical content features of sixteenth-century peritexts demonstrates that presenting the writer's educational background was a necessary part of the genre.

The prologue and dedication were extremely common textual genres in the sixteenth century; the readers had grown accustomed to them. Anderson (2002: 637-638) notes on the necessity of paratext in the early printed book, using historical sources to show that by the mid-seventeenth century, establishing the paratextual device was not only necessary, but required. Through the analysis of ironic, aggressive, or cavalier greetings in prologues, he argues for a formula in peritexts which would be familiar to the contemporary reader. The premise of this claim relies on the reasoning that the formulaic expressions of many prologues became so familiar to the reader that it was possible to alter them (see also Saenger's (2006: 60-63) analysis of a sixteenth-century satirical dedication).

The sixteenth-century prologue and dedication can be seen differing somewhat from the definitions offered by Genette (1997: 196-293). First and foremost, there was no clear content division between the two genres. While the *CCP* paratexts are divided according to their title into prologues and dedications, the contents of the texts contain no apparent thematic differences besides the act of dedicating itself and the address of the reader. Furthermore, out of the six functions of prefaces given by Genette (discussed in subsection 2.1.1), two were not identified in *CCP*. The function of *novelty/tradition* cannot be found in the *CCP* material, perhaps being overlaid by the greater stress on the *importance* of the subject matter. Similarly,

¹ Janson (1964: 12-13) contests the possibility of viewing preface as genre due to historical discontinuity in its use. Although the use of Latin and Greek paratext devices was indeed not continuous, the topoi were reintroduced in the Renaissance. This is seen here as sufficient continuity of the tradition.

while the function of *unity* cannot be evidenced in the *CCP* texts, *truthfulness*, or the faithfulness to the main text and the meaning of its original version, is an extremely common topic. The function of the paratext acting as a *lightning rod* is heightened in the sixteenth-century material, as one of the purposes of the dedicatory genre itself was to direct criticism towards the patron, who was often more socially or politically powerful and a far more resilient target to these kinds of attacks. Finally, the most important of the functions of the modern prologue, the wish “*to ensure that the text is read properly*”, is central to the historical peritexts studied, and not limited to the genre of prologue (Genette 1997: 197). Indeed the use of evaluative language in both prologues and dedications studied in this thesis could be viewed as extension of this wish.

The greatest differences between the *CCP* paratexts and their modern counterparts can be seen in the dedication. The dedicatory letter of the sixteenth century was far more detailed than its modern equivalent. While Genette’s (*ibid.*: 197) central definition of dedication as “a token of esteem to a person” is topical in the context of sixteenth-century paratexts, it is also rather narrow. A close reading of the *CCP* (2012) texts reveals that there were two other functions as well, both of equal importance. The first of these functions is that of communicating wishes and requests. These requests ranged from the generic, formulaic wishes for attention and goodwill of the general reader in prologue, to the more direct pleas for monetary compensation or other forms of patronage in the dedication (see e.g. Hiltunen 2012). The act of requesting patronage is central to the sixteenth-century dedication, and is no longer in existence in the modern one (see also Saenger 2006: 55-62). The final function of the dedication is to act as a lightning rod. This function of directing the reader’s criticism Genette (1997: 207-208) claims specific to the preface. However, in the sixteenth century, the dedicatory text as a whole was meant as a reflective, directing criticism towards the socially more powerful patron (see e.g. Brayman Hackel 2005: 113, 122).

In sum, the differences between the modern and sixteenth-century paratextual genres were dependent on the extratextual context of production. This context is the topic of the following section.

2.3. Paratexts in the sixteenth century: Context of production

After discussing the prologue and dedication in the section above, we will next turn to the general context of their production. The literary and cultural changes in the sixteenth century England were substantial, and many of these changes are reflected in the paratexts studied below. To facilitate the analysis in chapter 5, this section of the thesis will draw an overview of the relevant parts of the production process of the book and the cultural issues influencing such production in the sixteenth century.

The first of the topics relevant here relates to the shift in the processes of book production. Perhaps due to the rise of printing, the sixteenth century saw a remarkable number of new translations (Armstrong 2007: 42; see also Richardson 2009: 216-225). This produced some changes in the practices of translation. Traditionally, the translator had (or tried to get) a patron for their work. Occasionally the financial aid was secured before the work began, but there were other possibilities as well. Dedicating a previously completed work was done in the hope of monetary reimbursement or protection, or in to settle a previous debt (Voss 1998: 751). Even when dedicating to an unknowing patron, the dedicatory process relied on exchange. This exchange “exemplified a reciprocal process of validation and mutual benefit” (Binns 1996: 7). The writer gained patronage, and through it, in the mind of the reader, authority. The dedicatee received a lift in social status (*ibid.* See also Brayman Hackel 2005: 104-105; van Dam 2088: 14; Enenkel 2008: 44).

The presence of a separate dedication and prologue is characteristic to the Tudor period in particular. As Hiltunen (2012) notes, while the *CCP* contains a relatively even amount of dedications and prologues, the “separate dedications become an established pattern after c. 1550.” The custom of writing two paratexts, prologue and dedication, might be explained by the transitional characteristic of the period. The dedication addressed to the patron represented the old production method, locating the text “in the system of the social and political hierarchy, thus in a system of power”, whereas the prologue was to promote the book to the new reading public (Enenkel 2008: 39). Whatever the reason, there was a rapid decline of the tradition

after 1590s, resulting in a near-disappearance of the dedicatory genre (Fox [1995] 1999: 229-230; Genette 1997: 136; Voss 1998: 737; 755; Williams 1962: x).

The second important extratextual topic relates to the status of the English language. Unable to compete with the more accomplished continental printers in Latin or French texts, the English printer often chose to print in English (Shaw 2007: 221). As it was still a low-status language, English was not commonly considered suitable for literature of merit (e.g. Barber 1976: 65). The events of the sixteenth century, such as Reformation, as well as the new ideals of humanism, however, encouraged translation of popular continental and classical works, as well as religious ones (*ibid.*: 68-72; Binns 1996: 2; Morini 2006: 9-12; Shaw 2007: 221-222). The financial opportunities in providing low-status English works were compelling, and the paratexts reflect these attitudes. The tensions between perceived quality and marketing value are demonstrated in “status anxiety”, the overly modest attitude adopted by the translator in the rhetoric of the paratext (Rhodes 2011). The status of the language rose in the Tudor period, and as Barber (1976: 76) notes, the “uncomplimentary comparisons of English with other languages have largely disappeared” by the end of the sixteenth century.

The third important topic of extratextual cultural issues influencing the paratext is the discussion on the nature, status and the ideal of the art of translating. The topicality of the subject is visible in the frequent and explicit depiction of the principles in editing and translating the main text, and the evaluations that follow (*CCP* 2012; Hiltunen 2012). Many *CCP* paratexts remark on the method of translation through a formula: contrasting the so-called old word for word translation with the new meaning for meaning (sense for sense) approach (*CCP* 2012; Hermans 1985: 104-112, 123; Morini 2006: 5). While Timofeeva (2006: 135) shows this translation practice as already established in the Old English period, and presents the rhetorical formula as borrowed from ancient Latin works, Hermans (1985: 108) sees the formula as proof of a shift in translation practices in the Tudor period (see also Burnley (1989) for the late Medieval ideal, supporting Timofeeva’s (2006) view). While Matthiessen (1931: 4, 231) does not take part in the discussion about a possible shift in translation practices, he notes that the late sixteenth-century

translation was known for the substitution of “concrete image for an abstraction”, and for producing lively, dramatic works, cultural translations, and “social adaptation[s]” (*ibid.*: 6-7; see also Burnley 1989: 42). As Morini has noted,

[the] modern, elocutionary, ‘stylistic’ translation did not replace medieval translation overnight: there is a long period – the dates vary from one European country to another, but the whole period can be circumscribed between 1400 and 1600 –in which the two co-exist and overlap.

(Morini 2006:13)

Whatever the nature of this shift in the translation practices, indeed whether or not there was a shift in practices, the production of quality translations was clearly an important topic in the sixteenth-century paratext: half of the *CCP* (2012) publications contain some reference to the demand of accuracy either in sense, meaning, or words.

The production of the book in between the two traditions of printing and hand-production, the shift in the status of the English language, and the high interest in translation practices often all manifest through a common nominator: the *modesty topos* (MT). MT expressions are phrases of humility and modesty, through which the lightning rod-function of paratexts is realized. The expressions are an extremely relevant part of the Early Modern literary tradition, as well as the classical rhetorical one (Curtius 1990: 83-85; Janson 1964). Originating from the ancient classical rhetorical tradition, the practice was known as *captatio benevolentiae*, roughly translated as ‘striving for benevolence’, aiming to gain the goodwill of the listener. The practice was realized in the opening sections of a formally structured speech – known as the introduction or preface (Curtius 1990: 79-83). The Renaissance revitalized the use, perhaps because the concept of humility itself answered well to the Protestant ideals of the time (Saenger 2006: 58). Overall, by the sixteenth century, the practice had not changed much. The writer claims lack of skill, education or knowledge, in order to appear modest, and to counter possible criticism towards their work. Furthermore, according to Burnley (1989: 48), the commentary on the type and style of translation is historically dependent on the concept of humility, as the lexeme *translation* referred to the transformation or reformulation of others’ work to form one’s own. In narrating the editorial principles and portraying

the original as a far superior literary work, the Early Modern translator is connecting himself to the classical rhetorical tradition, all the while portraying himself as a mere imitator of the author, whose skill cannot be emulated (Hermans 1985: 103). In sum, in the sixteenth-century paratext, MT expressions act as a defense against criticism in a time of debate and tension in connection to the issues of literary production described above. By providing justifications for the choice of language, the writer uses MT expressions to excuse possible problems of style and grace in his writing, and to situate themselves in the current political trends through the appropriate rhetoric.

These three extratextual issues (production and dedication, status of the English language, views on of translation) are perhaps the most visible ones in the paratextual matter studied. Their visibility reflects their importance, and the use of MT expressions provides the translator with the most important devices for addressing these issues. The rather generalized notes made on the issues of cultural and situational context of production will be utilized in chapter 5 below. Before that, however, chapter 3 will give an overview of the theoretical approach adopted in this thesis.

3. Devices of evaluation

The main theoretical framework applied in this thesis is the *Appraisal Framework* (AF). It is an ongoing project compiled for the purposes of explaining the resources available to a speaker or writer when expressing their stance or positioning in relation to object, situation, person, or action in a communicative situation (Martin & White 2005; White 2001a; White 2001b). The framework categorizes the devices of evaluation, affect, and opinion, and the ways in which speakers and writers accomplish expressions with which they “approve and disapprove, enthuse and abhor, applaud and criticize, and with how they position their readers/listeners to do likewise” (Martin and White 2005: 1).

The AF was born into the tradition of *systemic functional linguistics* (SFL), an influential theoretical framework studying language as a social semiotic, an

interpersonal system of creating meaning (e.g. Halliday 1981: 14-15). Depending on the viewpoint, the studies of evaluative language within this tradition have centered on feeling, emotion, affect, stance, opinion, evaluation, connotative meaning, mood and modality (see e.g. Bednarek 2006b; Conrad and Biber [2000] 2001; Hunston [1994] 2005; Thompson and Hunston [2000] 2001). In discussing manifestations of emotion, opinion and attitude under AF, this thesis follows Thompson and Hunston ([2000] 2001) in using the umbrella term *evaluation*. The term is used as “the broad cover term for the expression of the speaker or writer’s attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about” (*ibid.*: 5). As many of the approaches have focused on the grammatical structures of evaluation, they are unable to account for the full range of items used to produce evaluative language (Thompson 2004: 75). As a part of this group studying evaluation through SFL, AF approaches the study of interpersonal meaning chiefly through affect. For the purposes of this study, the strength of AF lies in the fact that it is mainly a lexically oriented approach and hence accounts for the more indirect ways of expressing opinion (Bednarek 2006b: 19; Martin and White 2005: 2, 8; Martin [2000] 2001: 143).

Although the variability of terminology might indicate more difference than similarity between approaches, the essential connection between these studies is the importance ascribed to the speaker’s opinion in studying evaluative language (Thompson and Hunston [2000] 2001: 2). While AF (and other evaluative theories) allows the study of different semantic categories expressing opinion, e.g. comprehensibility, importance, seriousness, and reliability, the differentiation in the quality of evaluation in this thesis is limited to those of positive/ negative (Bednarek 2006a: 188-189).

The chapter below will draw together an overview of AF, focusing on the features relevant for the following analysis. As the studies into AF have taken two distinctive courses, so shall the sections below. First, section 3.1 will introduce AF, especially the devices of description, categorization, and naming of the recourses available for expressing opinion and emotion. The second juncture into AF, *positioning*, is the topic of section 3.2, and deals with contextualization: the communicative situations

and actors, and the effects of these constituents on the realization of the appraisal in language (White 2001b). The sections have been compiled mainly following the work by White (2001a; 2001b; 2001c; 2001d) and Martin and White (2005).

3.1. Introduction to Appraisal Framework

The Appraisal Framework was created due to a need for an approach mapping “interpersonal meaning in monologic texts” (Martin and White 2005: 8). This means the connecting of the interpersonality of SFL into the study of textual matter. This is achieved mainly through the *naturalization* of the text. Martin and White (2005: 63) portray naturalization as stating facts or opinions in a manner which offers a reading position sympathetic to the opinions and views of the writer, directing the reading of the text. This necessitates the understanding of the devices used by a speaker or writer in sustaining the communicative aspect of their texts while presenting their subjective views.

This section provides an introduction to Appraisal analysis, especially through *subtypes*, or the main categorization of Appraisal (White 2001a). All expressions of Appraisal are representations of the speaker’s or writer’s feelings, beliefs and opinions on the matters discussed. The general purpose of Appraisal is hence to convey a “positive or negative assessment”, or to praise or criticize a person, object or situation (White 2001b).

APPRAISAL	Subtype	Category	Describes
	ATTITUDE	AFFECT	phenomena using emotive response
		JUDGMENT	human behavior using social norms
		APPRECIATION	items and objects using aesthetics
	GRADUATION	FORCE	gradable categories of intensification or down-toning
		FOCUS	vague language, hedging
	ENGAGEMENT		negotiation between the author’s voice and the propositions set by the text

Table 1. Subtypes of Appraisal

Table 1 has been prepared so as to concisely portray the relationships between subtypes of Appraisal. *Attitude*, *Graduation* and *Engagement* are used for describing the expression of evaluation itself, the strength of the evaluation, and the author's commitment to the evaluation respectively. Attitude is further divided into three categories: *Affect*, *Judgment* and *Appreciation*, according to the object of description.

While Attitude focuses on the description of the main content of the evaluation mainly from the semantic point of view, the subtypes Graduation and Engagement concentrate on the secondary features of Appraisal, such as the modification of the expression. Although Table 1 has been prepared following the description by White (2001a) to reflect the relationships between the constituents of the Appraisal Framework, a division between Attitude and the other two subtypes in the table has been added to reflect these dissimilarities in the content of the Appraisal subtypes. Although the framework itself treats Attitude, Engagement and Graduation as equally relevant subtypes of Appraisal, the term subtype itself is considered misleading as the three cannot be viewed as equal parts of the framework. Attitude, Engagement and Graduation are all necessary in the evaluative expression. However, their analysis does not serve equal purpose in studying evaluation. Although any evaluative expression necessarily includes levels of Engagement and Graduation, Attitude is considered the subtype determining whether or not the expression can be studied as an example of Appraisal at all.

The division of AF into subtypes aims for comprehensiveness: all expressions of appraisal can be analyzed in terms of these categories. The categorizations are further divided into many types and subtypes, some of which are not utilized in this thesis. Fortunately, AF allows for its partial employment. In fact, individual sections of the theory have been more often applied in research than the full framework itself (e. g. Bednarek 2006b; Kaltenbacher 2006; Martin 1995; Suhr 2011). In accordance to the analysis conducted upon the expressions of evaluation below, the subtype given most visibility is, naturally, that of Attitude. The three subcategories of Attitude will be explored in subsection 3.1.1, after which subsection 3.1.2 will briefly narrate the

main points of Graduation and Engagement. In both subsections, the presentation of the theory will be accompanied by examples prepared for the use of this thesis.

3.1.1. Attitude

Out of the three subtypes of Appraisal in Table 1, Attitude is the one of central importance in analyzing expressions of evaluation in regard to the book in this thesis. Attitude conveys a portrayal of the speaker or writer's feelings and opinions towards the person or object under discussion.

Attitude includes “three semantic regions covering what is traditionally referred to as emotion, ethics and aesthetics”, given in Table 1 (Martin and White 2005: 42). A more detailed view into these categories of Attitude has been prepared below in Table 2.

ATTITUDE	Category	Target of evaluation	Tool utilized in evaluation
	AFFECT	any phenomena	emotion
	JUDGMENT	behavior or action	social norms
	APPRECIATION	product or object	aesthetics

Table 2. Categories of Attitude.

While Affect, Judgment and Appreciation differ from one another through target and tool utilized in the evaluation, all aspects of evaluation presented in Table 2 convey a subjective evaluation of the situation by the speaker or writer (Martin [2000] 2001: 147). Although White (2001a; 2001b) and Martin ([2000] 2001: 160) offer multiple finer distinctions and categorizations in terms of the tools utilized in the analysis, Bednarek's (2009) approach is considered the most useful for this thesis. She suggests noting the *attitudinal target*, or recognizing the added insight to the analysis brought by the exact target of evaluation. Indeed this idea is considered relevant here, as the analysis in chapter 5 will follow the target of the evaluative expression.

The subsections below explore the individual categories of Attitude. The subsection will begin with a brief discussion on Affect in 3.1.1.1. As this category of Attitude is not utilized in this thesis, it will be explained briefly. The more relevant categories,

Judgment and Appreciation, will be discussed in more detail in subsections 3.1.1.2 and 3.1.1.3 respectively.

3.1.1.1. Affect

Affect denotes assessment of person, item, action or event in terms of the emotive response they evoke (Kaltenbacher 2006: 271; Martin and White 2005: 45-52; White 2001c). Affect might manifest in the emotive response by the speaker/writer as well as the appeal for the emotive response from the reader/listener (Kaltenbacher 2006: 271). The examples below contain items of Affect (emphasis has been added to the item of Appraisal):

- (1) Spiders terrify me.
- (2) I'm sad to see you go.
- (3) I thankfully accept your help.

Examples (1) through (3) show simple manifestations of Affect: the emotional aspect is described through single vocabulary items. The parts of speech are varied (verbs, adjectives, adverbs), and the object or phenomena prompting emotion may be a physical object (*spiders*) or a more abstract concept or action (*go*, *help*). The emotive aspect is their main feature of similarity.

Although White (2001a; 2001c) has further divided Affect to *authorial* and *non-authorial*, including reported emotion as part of the framework, items of non-authorial Affect were not included as a part of the primary material. The division is briefly addressed in this section, as items of Affect help explain some items of evaluative language analyzed below. The division into authorial and non-authorial Affect can manifest in expressions such as:

- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| (4) I <u>was hurt</u> by your actions yesterday. | [authorial] |
| (5) <u>She was hurt</u> by your actions yesterday. | [non-authorial] |

As Bednarek (2006b: 32) notes, the “[n]on-authorial expressions of emotion are not part of the evaluation proper, which is only concerned with the expression of the *speaker’s* attitude” (italics as in the original). Essentially, while the authorial Affect

in example (4) is clear, example (5) is an evaluation by a third party. Hence the communicative act by the speaker is that of reporting, oftentimes even reporting their interpretation of a situation, rather than truly expressing emotion.

3.1.1.2. Judgment

While Affect can describe practically any phenomena prompting an emotive response, the second category of Attitude, Judgment, relates strictly to human character and behavior (Martin and White 2005: 52). Judgment is formed when the speaker or writer performs an assessment of the nature, actions and behaviors of others or self, or is attempting to influence the hearer or reader so as to get them to assume similar positions (Martin 1995: 31; White 2001d). Judgment involves “the institutionalization of feeling”, positions of morality or legality, or understanding of social mores, norms, and acceptable behavior (Martin [2000] 2001: 155). In essence, Judgment deals with our understanding of whether a person or their actions are bad or wrong. Examples (6) and (7) below contain simple items of negative Judgment.

- (6) He’s an unreliable friend.
- (7) They are not being honest.

In example (6), the item of Appraisal (*unreliable*) is a clearly negative word, which in reference to a person, creates the negative Judgment. The Judgment in example (6) does not rely on a position of morality or legality but on social understanding of a person’s character. In example (7), we move from one-word items of Appraisal to those requiring focus on the syntactic information to be correctly analyzed. The item itself (*honest*) has a clear positive meaning as Judgment. However, the full meaning is not revealed by the lexeme alone. While the positive aspect is indicated in the Judgment, it has been preceded by negation. Therefore the item is an example of negative Judgment.

White (2001a) further divides expressions of Judgment to *inscribed* and *evoked*.² Following White's (ibid.) original description, the division will be discussed here in subsection 3.1.1.2, in connection to Judgment. However, Martin and White (2005: 61-68) have later noted that the division is applicable to all aspects of Attitude, and this specification is utilized in all items analyzed below. The division of items to inscribed and evoked is essentially a question of explicitness. Inscribed items of Appraisal are "indicated by lexical items that carry clearly evaluative meanings" (Suhr 2011: 188). The items discussed so far have all contained an item of inscribed Appraisal.

The identification of evoked expressions requires some alertness on the part of the reader. Evoked Appraisal takes place when Attitude is not explicit, but interpretational or implicit (White 2001a). The evoked expressions "are triggered by superficially neutral, ideational meanings which nevertheless have the capacity in the culture to evoke judgmental responses (depending upon the reader's social/cultural/ideological reader position)" (White 2001a). The expression *ideational meaning* is central here. It is one of the three metafunctions of language listed by SFL; ideational, interpersonal and textual. Ideational metafunction refers to the communication of the "human experience" (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 29). When discussing Appraisal in connection to ideational meaning, the message is hence derived from the subjectivity of the account. The evoked evaluation is successful as a message because of the shared human experience. In essence, we are "expected to make the appraisal ourselves" (Thompson 2004: 78). For example:

- (8) His mother is neglecting him.
- (9) His mother works full-time.

² Later, Martin and White (2005) have renamed the categories as *invoked* and *inscribed* Attitude. Although the term *evoked* is still utilized when contrasting instances of implied and explicit, no clear differentiation is made between the terms *evoked* and *invoked*, nor is the change of terminology addressed. Hence the original terminological choice is preserved in this thesis.

To some readers, examples (8) and (9) might evoke essentially the same evaluation. While example (8) inscribes a clear negative Judgment through the lexeme *neglecting*, example (9) is more interpretational. As Martin (2003: 172) notes, “[c]onservatively speaking, we might argue that there is no need to analyze evaluation here.” However, the evoked Appraisal “assume[s] shared social norms” (White 2001a). Offering contextualization for example (9) provides various possible interpretations. In the more conservative societies, for example, the expression might be interpreted as a negative Judgment.

Evoked Appraisal might not be accepted by the reader. This is where the problem of “reading positions” becomes significant (Martin 1995: 32). The evoked Appraisal is essentially the writers’ interpretations of the matter discussed, left to the reader to decipher through (shared) ideational meaning in the expression. Should the reader reject the position, the Judgment is not effective. Martin (1995: 33) notes:

This, then, is the central dilemma of appraisal analysis. A text may have inscribed judgments which we can decide to comply with, resist or tactically ignore. Moreover, any text has the potential to be read judgmentally, whether these judgments are directly inscribed or not.

(Martin 1995: 33)

The reader’s acceptance of Appraisal is highly dependent on the position the reader takes towards the text. For example, the possible readings of a political newspaper differ greatly depending on whether the reader is supportive of the ideology presented in the text. The resistant reader will not be accepting of the Judgment offered, nor perhaps even able to recognize the positive or negative evaluation as such, as their own positioning towards the texts has an effect on their reading of it (Martin [2000] 2001; White 2001d). Similarly, our understanding of sixteenth-century texts is limited through our contemporary perceptions and understandings. Hence the contextualization of the interpretation is central, as the meaning is constructed through an understanding of both the interpersonal situation and the possible cultural distance from the contemporary reader (the cultural distance was addressed in section 2.3 of this thesis). In sum, White (2001a; 2001d) describes the difference between inscribed and evoked expressions of evaluation as one of

meaning in context. If an evaluative expression is dependent on the reader's cultural social or distance from the text to be understood, the evaluation is evoked.

Martin and White (2005: 62-63) have suggested that in order to take some distance from the subjectivity of this sort of analysis, the existence of evoked Appraisal should, when possible, be ascertained by analyzing two possible devices used: *coloring* or *sign-posting*. Coloring refers to inscribed expressions of evaluative meaning which direct the reader into recognizing how the evoked evaluation is to be interpreted. This is possible, as "the prosodic nature of the realisation of interpersonal meanings such as attitude means that inscriptions tend to colour more of a text than their local grammatical environment circumscribes" (Martin and White 2005: 63). While the inscribed Appraisal used would perhaps be in a separate clause or sentence from the evoked one, it would set the tone and direction of interpretation for the evaluative meaning for the textual context. "Inscribed attitude, in other words, launches and subsequently reinforces a prosody which directs readers in their evaluation of non-attitudinal ideational material under its scope" (Martin and White 2005: 64). In essence, using an expression of inscribed Attitude notifies the reader of the writer's position, and assuming prosody of Attitude, this knowledge affects the understanding of the following discourse.

Martin and White (2005: 64-67) and White (2001d) give several other methods of sign-posting ideational meaning expressed in the evoked items of Appraisal, such as through the use of metaphor (*He's a wolf in sheep's clothing.*), intensity (*I must have called you a hundred times!*), and counter-expectancy indicators (*He promised. Yet, I am not convinced.*), appearing within the clause or in syntactic context. These sign-posts serve the reader in indicating the reading position the paratext writer wishes the reader to adopt.

In the next subsection, the last of the subcategories of Attitude, Appreciation, is discussed before moving on to other subtypes of Appraisal.

3.1.1.3. Appreciation

The last category of Attitude, Appreciation, concentrates on the aesthetic. It is quite similar to Judgment, as they both deal with items outside the self. As can be seen in Table 2, the separating feature between the two is the object of Appreciation. Whereas Judgment always deals with a human actor, Appreciation deals with physical objects and abstract entities (White 2001e). The items below exemplify this category of Attitude:

- (10) The hideous slum was not even livable.
- (11) A beautiful woman is an important feature of any action film.

Again, as in Judgment above, we can see the positivity or negativity of the expression inscribed in the linguistic item. Lexemes such as *hideous* or *beautiful* convey the evaluative aspect. Item (10) is a prototypical example of negative Appreciation, containing explicit, uncomplicated, aesthetics-based evaluation.

Although Appreciation most often focuses on the aesthetic description of objects and products, it can be in certain situations utilized in describing people, such as in example (11), where the aesthetic evaluation (*beautiful*) is followed by a stereotypical evaluation of an entity (*an important feature*). In these kinds of evaluations, the persons are viewed as entities, rather than as “participants who behave” (White 2001a).

Appreciation of entities should not be confused with Judgment, which deals with people, their characters and actions, and their evaluation on moral or legal grounds. As a point of clarification, examples (12) and (13) portray items of Appreciation and Judgment in similar sentence structures.

- (12) This author is excellent; he is truly knowledgeable in this subject.
- (13) The author is lying about the events!

Although both items contain an authorial Appraisal, the item (*excellent*) in example (12) is an evaluation of positive quality, while example (13) (*lying*) contains a

negative evaluation of action. Therefore example (12) is categorized as positive Appreciation, and (13) as negative Judgment.

While Martin and White (2005: 56-57) list five types of further classification of Appreciation, these subcategories are considered too exacting for the purposes of this study. Only the most general of divisions, positivity/ negativity, is applied in the analysis.

As a final note on the categories of Attitude, it should be remembered that the division of items into categories is never as simple as the framework would suggest. Besides the cultural distance discussed in section 2.3, the syntax of the expressions sometimes allows for several interpretations. For example:

(14) The beautifully written poem touched many listeners.

Example (14) can be read as an aesthetic evaluation of the poem, in other words, a positive Appreciation. However, the item also allows a second reading, as a positive Judgment of the author. These items White (2001d) has labeled *double coded* (see also Martin and White 2005: 67).

3.1.2. Graduation and Engagement

This section is to give overviews of the two remaining subtypes of Appraisal, Graduation and Engagement (see Table 1). They denote the processes by which the speaker can either strengthen or lessen the impact of the message, or to stress their position in the communicative situation (Martin and White 2005: 37). Although there are very few items in the primary material which can be discussed through Graduation and Engagement, neither the strength of the message nor the speaker's position are the primary focus of this study. They will only be visited in this subsection in brief.

Graduation explores the strength and vagueness of the expression. Different levels of Graduation influence the “interpersonal impact” of the message (White 2001a). The speaker may use gradation, vagueness, intensifying, downtoning, hedging or a number of other techniques to express the intensity of their message and “locate

themselves with respect to the communities of shared value and belief” (Martin and White 2005: 94). Consider, for example, the Affect example (1) above (*Spiders terrify me.*). The expression denotes a rather strong example of Graduation, whereas the same approximate message could have been achieved with less strength, as in example (15):

- (15) Spiders frighten me.
- (16) He’s a true patriot.
- (17) He helped us sort of steal it.

Martin and White (2005: 142-143) present other possibilities for Graduation, the intensifying or downtoning an utterance. These include lexemes, such as *utterly*, *most*, *perfectly*, and even lexical modifiers such as *rock hard* and *pitch black*. Some of the expressions could be regarded as hedging or vagueness (White 2001a). This is the case in the items (16) and (17), which portray the opinion of the speaker by expressing their commitment to the message. Consider example (16). Removing the premodifier (*He’s a patriot.*) would deliver essentially the same message. However, through Graduation the speaker claiming the person discussed is a part of a more restricted group. Similarly, the general message of example (17) could be achieved with *He helped us steal it*. However, the expression of Graduation (*sort of*) draws attention to the possible figurative use, or to the fact that the speaker does not wish to call the action stealing.

The third category of Appraisal, Engagement, deals with the author’s stance. This can mean the relationship between the text and the author’s voice in the text, or the relationship between the author and the imagined reader. The realization of the position taken by the writer is therefore influenced both by the text and the intersubjectivity of the act of speaking or writing (White 2001a; White 2001g). The writer positions themselves in reference to earlier speakers and their positions, and prepares for the possible Engagement of others (Martin and White 2005: 92-93). The speaker or writer is always actively adopting positions in comparison “to past, present and future processes of communicative exchange” (White 2001g).

In sum, Martin and White (2005: 95) view interpersonalitv as the central feature of Appraisal Framework. They argue for a viewpoint in which the resources for Appraisal given above are used by the writer in attempt to “write the reader into text” by taking their shared opinions for granted, or when necessary, countering the differences of opinion by addressing them directly in the text (*ibid.*). This can be witnessed, for example, in the following examples:

(18) Bring your Legally Blonde DVD to the classic movie night!

(19) Please correct any mistakes found in the text.

The attempt of naturalizing evoked Appreciation in example (18) is glaringly apparent to all who do not share the speaker’s taste in movies. The speaker has situated the object of evaluation in the beginning of the clause in order to naturalize a viewpoint of the movie belonging to the mentioned group of classic movies. Example (19) is anticipating conflict. By answering to the challenge of possible critics in advance, the speaker has removed the cause for negative evaluation and hence the possibility of criticism.

After briefly going through the subtypes of Gradation and Engagement, the next section concentrates on a feature of Appraisal closely related to Engagement: positioning.

3.2. Positioning: Functions of Appraisal

Martin and White (2005: 2) view Appraisal not only as a way of analyzing the attitudes of the speaker or writer but also as a tool of evaluating the speaker’s or writer’s position and authority over the main text itself. The writer’s authority over text refers to the writer’s opportunity to choose whether to portray items as fact or opinion, and whether the writer gives the reader an opening for disagreement (White 2001b). This differentiation can be seen in expressions such as *I think that he stole from me* and *He stole from me*, where the addition of *I think that* leaves room for the reader to disagree.

The term *positioning* denotes the interpersonal functions achieved by the Appraisal subtypes given above. As the purpose of this thesis is to recount the ways in which the sixteenth-century paratext evaluates the book, the subtypes described above will maintain a central position in the analysis. However, seeing that the realization of Appraisal – the exact form of the evaluative expression – is often dependent on the stance the speaker or writer adopts towards their subject, it is necessary to go briefly over the possible positions available to the producer of the text as well.

According to White (2001b; 2001f) there are three types of positioning: *attitudinal*, *dialogistic* and *intertextual* positioning. Out of the three, *attitudinal positioning* is the one central for the purposes of this study. The positioning reflects and reproduces the “value system[s] of the community”, naturalizing the evaluations within discourse (Hunston [1994] 2005: 210). It deals with the realm of evaluation, much alike the examples discussed above in subsection 3.1.1: praising, blaming, assessing and judging (White 2001b). Consider example (8), *His mother is neglecting him*. The attitudinal positioning of the speaker or writer is realized through evaluative language. The positioning functions to bring forth an internal evaluation of the situation by the speaker.

Dialogistic positioning conveys situations where the speaker or writer responds to an item previously presented by another, takes position in a conversation or anticipates the continuation of a dialogue within their own contribution.

[T]hese dialogistic resources involve meanings which are ‘negotiatory’ in that they are concerned with managing or negotiating interpersonal relations between the speaker/writer and actual or potential respondents. They are brought into play when the speaker/writer judges that some degree of difference or disagreement is likely or at least possible with his/her actual or possible communicative partners.

(White 2001b)

Dialogistic positioning accounts for those features of Appraisal which seek to situate the writer in terms of earlier communication through responsive or anticipatory commentary. A request for corrections in example (19) above (*Please correct any mistakes found in the text*) might act as an example of dialogistic positioning. In asking the reader to correct mistakes made in the writing of the text, the author is

anticipating such a comment and giving the appropriate answer in the context. In example (20) below we see how the dialogistic positioning of the speaker, realized through simple Judgment, serves to distance the speaker from the content of the message.

- (20) The Republicans claim to be speaking for the majority.
- (21) I think I like the left one better.

In example (20), the speaker is not only reporting messages by others, but also taking a stance in terms of the truth value of the message. White (2001b) notes that dialogistic positioning is achieved “by explicitly revealing the subjective basis of the current proposition as based in some individual opinion, assessment, interpretation or perspective.” The subjective basis of the evaluation is made explicit in example (21) above. It should be noted that unlike the attitudinal positioning above, none of the definitions offered by White (2001b) demand the items conveying the dialogistic positioning are Appraisal. The dialogistic positioning exemplified by *think* in example (21) cannot be seen as the item of Appraisal itself. Rather the positioning displayed by *think* is making visible the speaker’s commitment to the Affect expression *like*.

The third and final type of positioning is called *intertextual positioning*. White (2001b; 2001f) defines intertextual positioning as the expressions of stance towards other utterances and texts. In its most uncomplicated form, intertextual positioning is a combination of a quotation or reference and the expression of position relating to that quotation by the writer. Example (22) shows the writer situating himself as agreeing with the previous text.

- (22) Given the time of writing the work is “innovative” indeed!

By adopting an intertextual positioning showing approval of the original sentiment, the writer is taking a positive stance in regard to the quoted text. This positioning by the writer White (2001b) would call *endorsement*, or agreement with the source text.

White (2001b) admits that intertextual positioning could perhaps be better viewed as a subcategory of dialogistic positioning; the main difference between the two being the presence of all participants of the communicational situation. The differentiation is considered questionable, and hence intertextual positioning is considered a subcategory of dialogistic positioning, as suggested by White (*ibid.*).

The next chapter will briefly address the issues of material and methods utilized in this study, before moving on to the analysis of the evaluations in chapter 5.

4. Material and method

The material for this study consists of a selection of translators' paratexts collected from the *Corpus of Sixteenth-Century Paratexts* (2012). All *CCP* texts have been collected through word searches from the *Text Creation Partnership* (TCP) version of the *Early English Books Online* (EEBO) database and later encoded into XML format to create files searchable with the *WordSmith Tools* corpus software. The primary demand for the texts to be included in the *CCP* was that the texts were to be peritexts written by English translators during the sixteenth century. Furthermore, the texts were to have been printed in England and available in TCP for the purposes of later application into corpus software. A reliable verification of the translator as the paratext's producer was to be found either from the primary text or the EEBO metatext. The 61 titles chosen for *CCP* contain 86 paratexts: 37 dedications, 48 prologues and two epilogues. The 86 encoded text files were given short titles parsed together from the content words of the original title of the work and the paratext genre. Hence the XML file containing the prologue of *The vertuose boke of distyllacyon* has been titled *bokdistypro*. Finally, the files were compared to the EEBO picture files and all dissimilarities between the digital copy and the TCP transcription were edited out. These corrections are marked by square brackets in the examples below. It should be noted that the *CCP* file names have been utilized in referencing the primary material in this thesis.

Short title	Pub.	Title	STC	Translator	Words
lyfsaint pro	1500	Lyf of saint katherin	24766	n/a	620
olycasty ded	1518	[Here endeth ye hystorye of Olyuer of Castylle, and of the fayre Helayne]	18808	Watson, Henry	180
bokdisty pro	1528	The vertuose boke of distyllacyon	13436	Andrew, Laurence	360
mortmanned ded	1534	Mortalitie of man	6157	Eliot, Thomas	480
mortman pro		The rules of a christian lyfe			380
apophth pro	1542	Apophthegmes	10443	Udall, Nicholas	1350
troades ded	1559	Troades	22227a	Heywood, Jasper	500
troades pro					720
oedipus ded	1563	Oedipus	22225	Neville, Alexander	820
oedipus pro					470
survvor ded	1572	The surueye of the vworld	6901	Twyne, Thomas	410
survvor lpro					420
palengl ded	1588	The famous, pleasant, and variable historie, of Palladine of England	5541	Monday, Anthony	310
palengl pro					190
boconst ded	1595	Tvvo bookes of constancie	15695	Stradling, John	510
boconst pro					1040

Table 3. Primary material.

As the analysis below is mainly qualitative, and conducted through a close reading of the relevant paratexts, the *CCP* was considered far too large to be utilized in full. Hence, ten titles were chosen as primary material, one for each decade of the century. The full list of primary texts is given below in Table 3.

The table shows material collected according to publication year. Additional details given include the short title of the paratext, full title of the published work, the Short Title Catalogue number (STC) for identification, approximate word count of the paratext and the name of the translator. All paratexts have been presented in the order they appear within the title, with dedication always preceding the prologue. Additionally, the table shows the length of the paratexts. The variation in the length of paratexts in this thesis (180-1350 words) was not uncommon, as the *CCP*, used as a secondary source for this thesis, contained paratexts ranging from approximately 140 to 14 460 words (*CCP* 2012). A more detailed version of Table 3 has been given in the appendix 1.

The titles chosen as primary material of this study were to contain both a dedication and a prologue. However, due to the low number of books published in the beginning of the century, *CCP* (2012) contains no titles produced 1500-1529 containing both a translator's dedication and prologue (on the discussion on the prominence of the dedicatory genre in the sixteenth century see section 2.3). Table 3 shows that the ten titles chosen contain seven translators' dedications and nine prologues. Epilogues were left out of the study due to the scarcity of the evaluative expressions in them. As a result, the number of translators' paratexts used as primary material in this thesis is sixteen.

It should be noted that the division of paratextual matter into genres (dedication and prologue) is shown in the short titles given to each primary text. The division itself is stressed in this thesis as it is assumed that the demands of the textual genres place some restrictions on the types of evaluative expressions appearing in the paratexts themselves (the paratextual genres themselves have been explored in section 2.1).

Table 3 shows the previously discussed distinction between dedication and prologue appearing in the mid-sixteenth century. As mentioned above, the first three decades of *CCP* material contained no titles with both dedication and prologue, as the changes in the industry of book production influenced the paratextual genres and their use. There were also other historical issues influencing the material of the *CCP* – and by extension, of this thesis. For example, it was common for two or more works were printed as one entity. This is the case with *The mortalitie of man* (see Table 3), in which two titles have been published in the same work, with both main texts containing their own paratextual matter. These two works are here treated as one (*mortmanded* and *mortmanpro*), not only because they were translated by the same person, Thomas Eliot, but also because Eliot makes epitextual references to the latter of the titles in the paratext of the first. Therefore it can be claimed that the main texts are to be seen as a whole.

A final note of the historical situation of the primary material relates to the order of appearance of paratextual matter in the book. To utilize the full benefits of having a noble dedicatee, the dedication was commonly placed in front of the prologue, right

after the title page. This of course meant more visibility for the patron, and a strong recommendation for the work even before the reader was to familiarize himself with the contents of the work.

The chosen sixteen texts were subjected to a close reading so as to find all evaluative expressions related to the book. The choice of items was conducted according to the attitudinal targets, or the targets of the evaluative expression (see Bednarek 2009: 180). Appropriate attitudinal targets for the purposes of this study deal either with the book itself, or one of its producers. This is because the evaluation directed towards the author or translator is considered evaluative of the book (this issue is further addressed in chapter 5 below). The collection of material was begun by marking all evaluative expressions within the text. (An example of a primary source text with items of evaluation marked for analysis can be found in Appendix 2.) After this, the items considered evaluative were collected into one table. The expressions were then roughly categorized according to the demands of the AF, marking positive/ negative, evoked/ inscribed, as well as making notes were made according to the object of evaluation as well as the possible multiple levels of Appraisal in the example. (An example of such a table has been included in Appendix 3.) This categorization was done mainly following White (2001a) and Martin and White (2005: 71).

It should be noted that the cultural differences between reader and writer shape the reading position chosen in this thesis. Not only does the syntactic context of the utterance influence the interpretation, but the cultural context does as well. The analysis is further complicated by the fact that the expected reader positions influenced the writing of the paratext (White 2001a). In other words, the writer's knowledge of the reader's possible responses to the text is not shared by the analyst, and because of this, some of the more implicit items of evaluation are well and truly beyond this study. However, some of the cultural differences, such as the convention of modesty topos, discussed above in section 2.3, are well-studied and will hence be utilized below in analyzing the more complex items constructed through the use of layers of evoked and inscribed Appraisal. Additionally, Martin and White (2005: 62) stress the necessity of explicitly stating the reading position of the analyst, especially in studies centered on evoked evaluation. The proper understanding and analysis of

evaluative language is not only dependent on the knowledge of cultural and situational context, but also on the attitudes and views the reader has of the text (Martin [2000] 2001: 161). In sum, the knowledge and position of the analyst plays a role in the results of the analysis. The position chosen for the reading of the paratexts was *tactical*, or meant to adopt a position in which the text is read “for social purposes other than those it has naturalised” (Martin and White 2005: 62). In other words, the reading aims to take into account the historical, cultural, and class differences between the reader and writer and incorporate these differences into the interpretation of the text.

As noted above, the analysis was begun by dividing the evaluative expressions into positive or negative. Further distinctions in the material were made in accordance to the theoretical background of the study, concentrating on Appreciation and Judgment, as expressions of Affect were rare, and considered somewhat outside the focus of the study. As the division between inscribed and evoked evaluation is not always clear, and as the analysis of Appreciation extends to the evaluation of persons as well as to the evaluation of objects, the main structure of the analysis below has been constructed around the target of the evaluation.

5. Analysis and discussion

This chapter is to explore evaluation and evaluative language found in the translator’s paratexts of the chosen ten sixteenth-century publications. This is achieved with the use of the Appraisal Framework, and more specifically, the concepts of Appreciation and Judgment. The 16 paratexts studied contain a vast repertoire of evaluations of the book. Not all items found will be discussed below. Rather, an attempt has been made to convey as wide a representation of the variation as possible.

As mentioned before in chapter 4, there are two essential topics of evaluative language included as relevant instances of evaluation of the book in this thesis. Any evaluative language with the attitudinal targets of literary products, their contents, style, or other features is a self-evident first category. The second topic of evaluative

language relates to the people commonly present in the paratexts. The author and translator, in specific, are subject to frequent and elaborate evaluations. The analysis of these items is founded on the claim that in making evaluations on an object of art, one is making evaluations on the maker thereof, and vice versa (Martin and White 2005: 58). As the roles of these actors differ, the hypothesis is that their evaluation in the paratext differs as well.

The analysis begins with the items evaluating the book itself in section 5.1. The section only includes items of Appreciation, as Judgment is not applicable in the analysis of items and objects (see White 2001d). The section will be roughly divided into subsections according to the exact feature of the book targeted by the Appreciation, although it should be noted that the contents overlap and the exact feature evaluated is not always clear. Section 5.2 concentrates on the evaluation of the actors present in translators' paratexts. This section includes items of both Judgment and Appreciation, as the human actor can be evaluated through both of these categories of Attitude (see section 3.1.1.3 of this thesis). Both sections will also discuss the items as inscribed or evoked, positive or negative. The chapter ends in section 5.3, with a short discussion on the findings, and the implications of the evaluative expressions studied to the understanding of the Appreciation of the book in sixteenth-century translators' paratexts.

5.1. Evaluation of the book

This section focuses on those evaluative expressions which refer to a book, translation, or literary work. In the Appraisal Framework, the expressions discussed here are referred to as Appreciation (see subsection 3.1.1.3). Appreciation is the evaluation of "objects, artefacts, processes and states of affairs rather than with human behavior" (White 2001e). Alike any Appraisal, Appreciation may be positive or negative, inscribed or evoked.

As the ways in which the Appreciation is formed can be tremendously varied, the general order of the subsections below has been arranged so as to proceed from the simplest items towards the more complex, concentrating on the content of the

evaluative expression. The subsections will begin with the semantically and syntactically simplest, most explicit items of Appreciation. According to White (2001a) an Appraisal is inscribed when it “is explicitly expressed by means of a particular lexical choice.” This means that the first items discussed below contain a single lexical item or slightly longer expression which contains evaluative meaning. Although Martin and White (2005: 58) have described “the canonical grammatical realization” of the expression of Appreciation as adjectival, the definition allows for other forms as well. After discussing inscribed Appreciation, each subsection will move towards the more complex items, ending in the evoked items of Appreciation.

It should be further noted that in analyzing Appreciation, Martin and White (2005: 59) stress the importance of acknowledging both the “source and target of evaluation.” This relates to the additional meaning of the evaluative expression, derived from the actors, items, and events usable as objects of Appreciation, and their relationship with the book. Hence the subsections below are constructed according to the general topic of Appreciation. Subsection 5.1.1 centers on the abstract evaluation of the main text as a whole, and subsection 5.1.2 on the evaluative expressions dealing with specific features of the book. Finally, subsection 5.1.3 studies the inscribed Appreciation of the translation.

5.1.1. The main text as a whole

In their least complex and most direct form, expressions of inscribed positive and negative Appreciation contain a head noun referring to the main text as a whole, and a qualifier such as a pre- or post-modifying adjective (Martin and White 2005: 58). Some examples have been given below:

(23) I might declare my good vvil, but am novv so hardy as to present your
vvorship vvith Dionysius, a vvorthie gentleman of Alexandria, vvwhose
noble vvorke of the Situation of the habitable VVorlde, I haue put of late
into English:

(survvorlde: 2v)

(24) Wherevpon the gentleman recommended vnto me an other excellent
booke of that argument

(boconstded: 2r)

- (25) Neither is it to bee doubted, but that suche as are towards the disciplines of good litterature in diuerse tounes, maye of suche dooynges as this, pieke out as muche vtilitee and furtheraunce of their studies, as the vnlearned shall take pleasure, and fruite of the Englyshe for their vse.
(apophthpro: 2v)

While these expressions seem to be evaluating the book as a whole, they are in fact focused on the description of the main text, and leave the notion of translation outside the evaluative expression. In all examples above, the evaluative meaning is inscribed in the underlined expression. Qualifiers such as *noble*, *excellent*, or *good* in examples (23) through (25) convey a fairly abstract level of Appreciation. The Appreciation is not very informative, and is clearly restricted to the plane of inscribed positivity.

Examples (23) and (24) contain abstract items of peritextual Appreciation related to the main text, whereas item (25), *good litterature*, describes works outside the current one. Although this example cannot be called an epitext, as the exact referent is not apparent from the expression, and hence it cannot act as a gateway to a main text, the item does contain some levels of epitextual meaning. It is a textual reference to other texts, spatially distant from its referent (Genette 1997: 4-5). The expression is here considered evaluative of the main text as the context of the item indicates the expression representative of the current work as well.

While these items are by far the most all-encompassing evaluations of the book found in the material, they limit the object of evaluation to the main text. The evaluation of the translation is left out, as evidenced by the context: the work is evaluated in the form it appeared pre-translation. The typical expression of inscribed Appreciation evaluating the main text as a whole is therefore an abstract, positively toned adjective. The evoked items of evaluation of the book similarly exclude the translation from the evaluative expression. Item (26) below contains perhaps the clearest examples of evoked Appreciation of the main work. The evaluation appears in a stereotypical context of Appraisal:

- (26) Now mynded to excercise my pen{n}e in mater to the rede[r] som what more {pro}fyttable / I haue chosen amonge all other the booke of distyllacyon of waters / wrytten by the thyrti yere labour of master Iherom Beunswyke / to Translate into Englysshe.

(bokdistypro: 2r)

Both items of evoked Appreciation in this example are positive ones. On the surface level, they seem to be evaluating the book pre-translation. However, the coloring of the items follows Martin and White's (2005: 62-63) definition to the letter. The writer is using an inscribed item of Appreciation (*{pro}fyttable*), in the first clause. After presenting the positive position taken by the translator, additional positive evaluation is evoked. The second clause of example (26), *I haue chosen amonge all other the booke of distyllacyon of waters*, contrasts the main text with other works available for translation. The expression implies a higher status for the work amongst other items of literature. The interpretation of the second item of evoked Appreciation in example (26) is more dependent on the reader. Here the book is referred to as the result of thirty years of work. This clause can either be identified as positive Appreciation of the work's quality or as containing no evaluative expressions at all, depending on the reader's attitudinal positioning (White 2001d). However, the item *{pro}fyttable* draws attention to the positive evaluation evoked in the reader, coloring the previous discourse and suggesting a positively evaluative reading.

Perhaps the most common way of evoking a positive evaluation of the book in the sixteenth-century paratext is through some sort of implicit comparison. This strategy was already seen in example (26), where the work evaluated was *chosen amonge all other*. Some additional examples of this device have been given below:

- (27) and in ye residue so to accepte both our laboures as we maye thereby bee encouraged gladly to sustein further trauaill in wrytyng and setting forth suche autours, as maye to the reader bee bothe pleasaunte and profitable

(apoththpro: 4r)

- (28) What shall I say, that ther haue bin many other worthy men of that name,
who haue be{n} supposed to be the authors of this boke?
(survvorlpro: 4r)

Both items given contain an evaluation of the main text's (hypothetical) author (*suche autours, as maye [...] bee bothe pleasaunte and profitable; worthy men*). The evoked evaluation of the book in examples (27) and (28) is created by a combination of inscribed Appraisal (*pleasaunte, profitable, worthy*) and the sentence structure. In example (27), the translator is stating his interest in producing additional (*ferther*) pleasant and profitable texts, hence implying that the main text at hand belongs to this group of beneficial texts as well. Similarly, in example (28), the main text is positively evaluated through stating that many worthy men have been assumed its authors. The positive Appreciation is quite subtle, as the direct object of evaluation is not the work itself, but another work or author, who is then contrasted with the main text.

In sum, the main text is equally likely to be evaluated through inscribed or evoked items of Appreciation, through directly modifying adjectives or more circumspect expressions of evaluation. Evoked Appreciation of the main text is often achieved through offering an inscribed or evoked evaluation of another object, work, or person, which is then contrasted with the current text. This achieves a sense of distance to the evaluation perhaps necessary for the translator in the context of production. In evaluating the main text, the items of Appreciation are of course always positive.

5.1.2. Individual features of the book

Whereas the examples discussed above deal with the whole work as an object of Appreciation, it is equally common to concentrate on a single characteristic of the book as the topic of evaluation. These feature-specific expressions are far more revealing in terms of the purposes of this study, especially when studying inscribed evaluation. Four major topics of evaluation stand out from the primary material. These include the subject matter, the profit derived from the reading of the main text

and the style or composition of the literary work. Following these, the fourth category concentrates on the evaluation of the exemplar, or the original copy used in translation. Items of this category are rare in the material, and are discussed below because of the singularity of their character.

Examples (29) and (30) below exemplify the first of these topics of evaluation, the Appreciation of the contents or the **subject matter** of the work.

- (29) Among which I chiefly approued that wherin I last laboured, being by the Author therof very learnedly handled, & hauing a notable Subiette, to wit, matter of pollicie and gouernmente in peace and warre.

(boconstded: 2r)

- (30) to defraude you of so many goodly histories, so many high poinctes of counsaill, so many notable preceptes of wysedome, so greate a noumbre of philosophicall lesso{n}s, suche vnestymable treasure of morall doctrine, as may of this litle porcion in ye meane tyme with small labour & incomparable delite, cou{m}forte and solace of mynd, bee perceiued, gathered, and acquired.

(apophthpro: 2r)

Both items above contain inscribed positive Appreciation of the book. The positive Appreciation of the contents or of the subject matter can manifest rather plainly, as in item (29), where the topic of the main text is simply evaluated as *notable*. This item, however, does not specify what exactly is considered so notable about the topic of policies of governance. Example (30) is far more specific in its inscribed positive Appreciation. The work contains *goodly histories*, *many high poinctes of counsaill*, *many notable preceptes of wysedome*, and an *vnestymable treasure of morall doctrine*. Not only are these items positively evaluative, but they contain a high Graduation (*many*, *vnestymable*). The work in question, *Apophthegmes* by Erasmus, is a collection of Latin and Greek proverbs and hence quite varied as to its contents, as can be seen from the variability of these inscribed expressions of Appreciation.

The evaluation of the contents of the work is not always achieved through adjectives, as in the examples above. In the sixteen peritexts studied, there exists great variation in the lexical items referring to literature, literary works and books in general. The

material contains lexemes such as *history*, *literature*, *treatise*, *trifle*, *fable*, *proverb*, *tragedy*, *legend*, *sermon*, *chronicle*, *discourse* (expressions referring to content); *work*, *fruit*, *travaille*, *attempt*, *translation*, *labor*, (expressions referring to the action taken by translator or other actor in the production); and *book*, *volume*, *piece* (expressions relating to the material object). Of course, not all of these lexemes are explicitly evaluative, and the possibility of interpreting them as evoked Appraisal is unnecessary and far too complex for the purposes of this study. However, a few of these lexical items have a relatively clear positive or negative connotation which is used in lending strength to the Appraisal. Similarly to the examples (29) and (30) above, examples (31) and (32) contain an inscribed Appreciation of the contents:

- (31) my onely wille and desire is to further honeste knowelage, and to call
(awaye the studious youth in especiall) from hauyng delite in readyng
phantasticall trifles, (whiche contein in manier nothyng but the seninarie
of pernicious sectes and sedicious doctrine, vnto a more fruitefull sorte of
spe{n}dyng good houres

(apophthpro: 3r)

- (32) AftEr dyuers & sondry small volumes & tryfeles of mytth &
p[a]tau{n}ce / Som newly composed / some translated and of late
finisshed / Now mynded to excercise my pen{n}e in mater to the
redesom what more {pro}fytable³

(bokdistypro: 2r)

Examples (31) and (32) contain several issues of interest. Firstly, the vocabulary item used to refer to genres of text (*trifles*, *tryfeles*) is defined by the *OED* as a “false or idle tale, told (a) to deceive, cheat, or befool, (b) to divert or amuse; a lying story, a fable, a fiction; a jest or joke; a foolish, trivial, or nonsensical saying” (*OED Online*, s.v. *trifle* n.). This item illustrates the fact that sometimes, it is the main word of the phrase which contains the item of evaluation, rather than a complement.

³ The vocabulary item *p[a]tau{n}ce* considered here a mistype of *pitaunce* (pittance), alms or charity. (*OED Online*, s.v. *pittance* n.).

Secondly, the example pair shows the significance of syntactic context in the analysis of evaluation (see Martin and White 2005: 63). In example (31) the negative evaluation inscribed in *trifles* is further strengthened by the surrounding discourse. The adjectives (*pernicious*, *sedicious*), referring to harmful, mutinous texts, are modifying the content-related items (*OED Online*, s.v. *pernicious* adj.; *ibid.*, s.v. *seditious* adj.). Hence the context of the evaluative expression in (31) is extremely negatively colored. Contrastingly, when example (32) utilizes the item *tryfeles* as referring to the translator's previous works, the missing negative coloring produces a certain lessening in the severity of the negative Appreciation inscribed in the item. The reference to religious content (*p[a]tau{n}ce*) further evens out the negative evaluation. Additionally, the reference to one's own works using a negatively inscribed item of Appreciation is a part of the MT tradition, encouraging the reader to interpret the whole discourse of evaluation as an expression of the tradition, rather than a communication of an opinion (see e.g. van Dam 2008: 26). In sum, in example (31) the inscribed negative Appreciation of the previous works is followed by inscribed negative Appreciation of their contents, creating a purely negative syntactic context, whereas the description of other works as volumes of *mytth & p[a]tau{n}ce* in example (32) is relatively neutral, and relies on cultural context for the understanding of the expression. These items confirm that the interpretation of inscribed Appraisal cannot be accomplished based on mere lexical analysis, and that the surface meaning of the evaluative expression can be extremely misleading, as the full message of the expression is largely dependent on the context.

An additional issue of interest in examples (31) and (32) is their epitextuality. The Appreciation in these items is achieved through the use of item *trifle* is considered somewhat epitextual, although not fully corresponding to the demands of the term (Genette 1997: 17). In (31), the works evaluated are not explicitly named, but the reader is expected to recognize the genres criticized. In example (32), the reference is specific enough for the text to fulfill the role of epitext, as the works referred to can be identified as translations by Lawrence Andrew, the writer of the paratext. Notably, these two epitextual evaluations are amongst the very few examples of inscribed negative Appreciation of the book found in the material.

The second out of the four major topics of evaluation of the book is the **result or benefit gained from the reading**. These results, effects, or gains to the reader can be seen in examples (31) and (32) above, in expressions *more fruitefull* and *more {pro}fyttable*. The benefits were a frequent motivation of evaluative language in connection to the book in the present material. Commonly, the benefits mentioned include references to either *knowledge*, *learning*, and *profit*, or to items such as *pleasure*, *comfort*, and *virtue* (CCP 2012). In examples (31) and (32), the positively evaluative expressions contrast with the previous items of Appraisal related to other works through the comparative *more*. In terms of AF, this is seen as an expression with high Graduation (see e.g. White 2001g). Although it is not explicitly stated that the *more fruitefull sorte of spe{n}dyng good houres* is achieved through reading the main text at hand, it is strongly implied by the context (*My onely wille and desire is to [...] call [readers] vnto a more fruitefull sorte of spe{n}dyng good houres*).

Unlike the items of inscribed positive Appreciation in examples (31) and (32), most expressions relating to the benefits of the work should rather be categorized as non-authorial Affect than Appreciation, such as in “you shall receyue singular delight in the reading hereof” (survworld: 3r). The end of example (30) contains a similar promise (*may [...] with small labour & incomparable delite, cou{m}forte and solace of mynd, bee perceiued, gathered, and acquired*). Items of non-authorial Affect were not included in the study. It was equally common, however, to achieve these evaluations through expressions of Appreciation. Items (31) and (32) above contain comparable examples, although achieved through a relatively indirect manner, through epitextual negative Appreciation. Items (33) and (34) below are perhaps more overt:

- (33) of the whole werke of Apophthegmes by the right excellent clerke Erasmus: for the moste plesaunte and the same moste honeste, profitable, & holsome readnyg of allmaner persones, & in especiall of noble menne collected and digested into eight volumes, I haue thought better with twoo of the eight to ministre vnto you a taste of this bothe delectable and fruiteful recreacion

(apophthpro: 2r)

- (34) I haue thought requisite to admonyshe you, that in eche ma{n}nes Apophthegmes the saiynge self is sette out in a greate texte lettre: after whiche ymmediatly foloweth in a middle lettre (with this marke) the moralizaciō of Erasmus, wheresoeuer to thesame it semed expediente any suche morall sense to gather of the Apophthegme for edifiyng of the reader in vertue or ciuile honestee.

(apophthpro: 3v)

Both of the above items provide examples of inscribed positive Appreciation of the main text through their effects on the reader. Example (33) evaluates the contents of the work as *plesaunte*, *honeste*, *profitable*, *holesome*, *delectable*, and *fruiteful*. All of these items are inscribed and highly positive examples of Appreciation, often containing heightened Graduation (*right*, *moste*). The example further promotes the work by giving a positive Appreciation of the writer (see subsection 5.2.1 for a discussion on the Appreciation of authors as Appraisal of the book). The most common themes of Appreciation of the book, based on their expected effects on the reader, are the ones portrayed by the lexemes *plesaunte* and *profitable* or any variation thereof. The topics of pleasure and profit appear repeatedly in the peritextual matter in connection to Appraisal, and in other evaluative contexts as well (e.g. olycastyded: 6r; boconstded: 2v; boconstpro: 3v; bokdistypro: 2r). Example (34) is slightly more explicit in the topic of the evaluation, stating that *it semed expediente [...] to gather of the Apophthegme for edifiyng of the reader in vertue or ciuile honestee* (apophthpro). Again, the evaluations are inscribed and extremely positive, with items *vertue* and *honestee* acting both as an evaluation of content and expected consequences of the reading of the text.

Third of the four major topics of evaluation is the Appreciation of the **style** in the original, untranslated main text. Some examples of this category are listed below.

- (35) how farre aboue my powre, to keepe that grace, and maiestye of style, that Seneca doth, when both so excellent a writer, hath past the reache of all imitacion, and also thys our englishe toong (as many thinke and I here fynde) is farre vnable, to compare with the latten

(troadespro: 4r)

- (36) I haue traunslated this lyttell boke: not supersticiouselye folowynge the letter, whiche is verely elegante, and therfore the harder to tra{n}slate into our langage, but kepyng the sentence and intent of the Autour
(mortmanded: 3r-3v)
- (37) For I to no other ende remoued hym from his naturall and loftye Style to our corrupt & base, or as al men affyrme it: most barbarous Language:
(oedipusded: 2r-2v)

Inscribed positive evaluation of the style of the original, as in examples (35) through (37), is perhaps the most classic aesthetic evaluation found in the material. The original is referred to in ornamental phrases signifying different aspects of beauty. The style of the text, pre-translation, is highly praised (*grace*, *maiestye*, *elegante*). However, as with examples (31) and (32), the text evaluated is not the work at hand, but rather the original main text, pre-translation. Hence these items could be considered epitextual, accounting for the fact that it is not the Latin or French main text which the reader is holding when reading the paratext. The evaluations of the untranslated main text reflect upon, and evaluate, the end result of the translation as well.

Examples (35) through (37) further show how the themes surrounding stylistic evaluations of the work are often intermixed with evaluations of relevant languages, authors and translators. The inscribed positive Appreciation of the author's style is understood in connection to the inherent features of the language, as can be best seen in example (35), where the inscribed positive Appreciation of the style of the original in *naturall and loftye Style* is contrasted with an inscribed negative Appreciation of the *most barbarous* English tongue. As previously noted in section 2.3, it was commonplace to evaluate the original language of the work above English, and for this reason, the contexts of these items often include examples of negative evaluation of English language, as well as positive evaluation of the language of the original. Therefore the matter of style and skill in writing is equally a matter of the language used.

So far, the Appreciation related to the book has been overwhelmingly positive. The examples containing negative evaluations above have been either epitextual, dealing

with other texts outside the present publication, as in examples (31) and (32), or rely on some other form of comparison, such as with the stylistic change in transforming the text from a more high-status language to English, in examples (35) through (37). There are very few examples of negative evaluations of the book found from the material. Therefore the fourth and last topic of Appreciation in relation to the book to be discussed here concentrates on the few examples of **inscribed negative Appreciation** of the book found in the primary material.

- (38) I nedes must craue thy pacience in reading, and facilitie of iudgement: when thou shalt apara{n}tly see, my wi[t]les lacke of learning, praying the to consyder. how harde a thyng it is for me, to touche at full in all poyntes, the aucthoures minde, (being in many places very harde and doubtfull and the worke much corrupt by the defaute of euill printed bookes)

(troadespro: 3v)

- (39) Fyrst forasmuch as thys worke semed vnto me, in some places vnpersyite (whether left so of the authour or part of it lost as tyme deuoureth all thynges I wotte not)⁴

(troadespro: 3v)

Examples (38) and (39) – both from the same work – are the only items containing inscribed negative Appreciation towards the book. They are not, however, negatively evaluative towards the contents or style of the main text, or indeed not necessarily towards anything produced by the original author. Rather, the cause of criticism in both is inaccuracy, specifically the errors and possible corruption of the exemplar. This inscribed negative Appreciation is achieved through lexemes such as *corrupt*, *euill*, and *unpersyite*, all of which refer to the problems in interpreting a damaged, or more likely, incorrectly typeset, edited, or printed exemplar (*OED Online*, s.v. *evil* n. and adj.). The examples are evaluating the material object of the book, not the contents and the textual matter. In example (39), the possibility of the author leaving

⁴ *Vnpersyite* understood here as a variant spelling of *unperfyit*, or *imperfect* (*OED Online*, s.v. *imperfect* adj. and adv.).

the work unfinished is also addressed. This expression, however, is left as open-ended and does not direct any negatively evaluative expressions towards the main text or author. Hence, no explicitly negative evaluations of the main text were found from the material.

Although it is not the purpose of this thesis to offer a quantitative analysis of the evaluative features in sixteenth-century paratexts, it should nevertheless be noted that there are some conventions as to how the expressions of inscribed Appreciation were found to have been distributed in the paratextual genres. The promotion of the work through positively evaluative language in connection to benefits of reading is a feature appearing near-exclusively in the prologues of this material. While other topics of evaluation discussed in this subsection were found in dedicatory materials as well, the evaluation of the main text through this sort of prescribed reading experience was apparent mainly in prologues. This prescribed reading experience, one in which reader is told the results of the reading beforehand, corresponds to what Genette (1997: 197) has called the most important function of prefaces: making sure the book is read properly. In the terms of AF, this corresponds to ascertaining that the reader adopts the position towards the main text suggested by the writer. Taking into account the intended readerships of the paratextual genres, the restriction of this sort of evaluative language only to prologues is reasonable. The addressee of the dedication was likely to be familiar with the work already, after reading the main text in its original language. Offering an interpretation of the text and its effects to the dedicatee would have been counterproductive. Furthermore, it was not the purpose of the dedication to convince the dedicatee to read the work, but to acknowledge it (see e.g. Saenger 2006: 55-56). It would perhaps require further study to ascertain whether the appearance of this sort of promotional element only in prologues is consistent throughout the rest of the paratexts of the century.

All in all, the individual features through which the book is evaluated are most commonly items of positive inscribed Appreciation dealing with the subject matter, style or expected effect of the reading. A surprising number of evaluative expressions targeted the text pre-translation. It was found that only one of the themes, evaluating the results of the reading, consistently targeted the text in a manner which included

the translation. The evaluation of the original text was meant to reflect upon the translated work as well. Additionally, it should be noted that while the material contains a number of negatively toned items of Appreciation of the book, these expressions were either epitextual or dealt with the book as a material object, hence excluding the main text itself from the scope of the negative evaluation. Instances of negatively colored evaluation were far more common in connection to the evaluative expressions dealing with the translation, as will be shown in subsection 5.1.3 below.

5.1.3. The translation

In analyzing Appreciation of a translated work from a translator's paratext, the evaluation of the translation is naturally one of the most prominent topics of Appraisal. This subsection presents the different types of evaluation of the translation, concentrating on the forms, contents and types of Appreciation typical to evaluative expressions of translation. The subsection proceeds in the relative order of simple to complex, although the exact order of items on this scale of complexity is certainly debatable. Some of the simplest items discussing the evaluation of translation are given below:

- (40) For the whiche cause, so muche the rather haue I suffred this my base tra{n}slated Tragedie to be publyshed:
(oedipuspro: 6v)
- (41) a simple zealous man, more deuoted in affection to your honors welfare, then able to expresse the same as other can, presents this rude and vnpullished peece of worke, not handled with arte, because I want it, nor glozed with borrowed phrases, because I am loth to become indebted:
(palenglded: 2r)
- (42) To whose prayse / and helthe of all my crysten bretherne / I haue taken vpon me this symple translacyon / with all humble reuerence
(bokdistypro: 2r)

Following the definition by Martin and White (2005: 58), examples (40) through (42) show some of the most prototypical examples of Appraisal in relation to translation. The items all contain inscribed negative Appreciation, in which the object of the Appreciation is the translated work, described as *base*, *rude*, *vnpullished* or *symple*.

While the appraised change from *Tragedie* to *worke* or *translacyon*, the target of the negativity remains the same. The adjectives used in examples (40) though (42) summarize the general tone of inscribed Appraisal of the translation, which is portrayed as plain, uncomplicated and unrefined. The issues of complexity of the translation and the effort required to produce the work are repeatedly downplayed in the paratexts studied. The negativity of items is partly the product of the demands of MT, dictating the attitude of the author and translator was to adopt towards their own work. The attitudes towards translation also influence the discourse, as the contemporary reader viewed translation as imitation, not creation (Hermans 1985: 103).

While the majority of the inscribed items evaluating the translation are clearly negative, one of the most common of the evaluative items, *simple*, in example (42), verges upon evoked Appreciation. The multiple meanings of this common lexeme complicate the analysis somewhat, as the sixteenth-century meanings contained both positive and negative connotations. According to *OED*, *simple* was understood as “[f]ree from elaboration or artificiality; artless, unaffected; plain, unadorned” or “[s]mall, insignificant, slight; of little account or value” (*OED Online*, s.v. *simple*, adj. and n.). While the majority of these definitions imply a negative Appreciation, they allow for positive evaluations as well; the work is presented as inartificial. It should be noted, however, that the available meanings of the vocabulary item in the sixteenth century also included reference to complexity, meaning that there is a possibility of a reading in which the item cannot be seen as evaluative at all, but referring to the actualized composition of the work. A further possibility exists to read the expression as a part of modesty discourse containing a relatively empty expression of evaluation – this explanation is indeed considered most likely in the context. Hence the intricacy of this lexical item: the meaning of the Appraisal can be read as sincere or insincere, positive or negative, assuming the evaluation is recognized at all.

In addition to *simple*, the lexeme *little* is one of the most commonly used evaluative expressions in the material. It is also one of the most complex. In the 16 peritexts studied in this thesis, the item appears seven times in the immediate context of the

main word such as *book*, *work* or *treatise*. Items (43) and (44) below exemplify this evaluative use of *little*:

- (43) the authoritie of your graces fauour towarde thys my little worke, may be
to measure defence and shield[e] against the sting of reprehending
to{n}gues

(troadesded: 3r)

- (44) I beg hartely of him which giueth euery good gift, that by reading &
meditating vpon this little treatise, it will please him to worke in thy mind
such a firme impression of CONSTANCIE, as neither the violent flouds
of common calamities may be able to wash away

(boconstpro: 4r)

There is only slight variation in the syntactic structures surrounding evaluative expressions such as the ones in examples (43) and (44). The exact lexical item referring to the book or work varies: here *worke* and *treatise* are used, but the vocabulary item *little*, disregarding typological differences, remains the key element of the phrase. The noun phrase is often preceded by a possessive (*my*) or other deictic expressions (*this*) marking the discourse as dealing with the current work of translation.

On the surface level, the lexeme does not appear to be evaluative. The adjective does not, however, refer to the physical size or any other external feature of the book discussed, but to the amount of work and time spent in producing it, as well as to the work's importance. By using this lexeme, the translated work is described as "[n]ot of great importance or interest; trifling, trivial" (*OED Online*, s.v. *little* adj., n., and adv.). Hence the lexeme in examples (43) and (44), in its cultural context, appears an expression of inscribed negative Appreciation of the work of translation.

The possible contexts of the expression further complicate the analysis. In (43), the expression is embedded in the discourse of dedicatee, which is a strongly positively colored discourse type in the paratexts. The mildly negative meaning of *little* is rather neutralized by the positivity of this discourse type (see section 5.2 for a discussion on the dedicatee). This raises questions of the sincerity of the evaluation.

Similarly, in example (44), the formulaic but apparently negatively inscribed expression is embedded in positively evaluative discourse of the contents of the main text.

The frequency of use of the lexeme suggests it is an item of importance for the paratextual genre. The lexeme also connects thematically to the classical paratext through *libellus*, or a little book, which van Dam (2008: 26) has identified as a part of the early rhetorical formula. It is therefore thought that *little* is not a straightforward negative evaluation, but a conventionalized way of communicating MT, or the writer's prostrating himself before the readers as a way of preemptively defending himself against criticism. The phrase (*thys my*) *little* (*worke*), among other conventionalized modesty phrases, conveys the translator's literariness and skill in utilizing the paratextual device. Although White's (2001a) definitions of inscribed and evoked Appraisal indicate that *little* should be categorized as inscribed negative evaluation of the work, it is felt that the apparently high Engagement of the writer is the result of conventionalized language. Therefore, the item is double coded as both positive inscribed Appreciation of the translation and as an evoked positive Appreciation of the translator. (For a discussion on the evaluation of the translator, see subsection 5.2.2.)

Indeed the evaluation of the translation can overlap with that of the translator, as can be seen in examples (45) and (46) below. As the evaluations of the translator it at the focus of subsection 5.2.2, the items are discussed from the point of view of the evaluation of the translated text.

- (45) WHen first right honorable Syr, I trauayled in the translation of this present Tragedie, Written by the moste graue, vertutuous & Christian Ethenicke (For so doubteth not Erasmus to terme him) Lucius A[n]neus Seneca: I minded nothyng lesse, than that at any tyme thus rudely transformed he shoulde come into the Prynters hands.

(oedipusded: 2r)

- (46) BEholde here before thy face (good Reader) the ryght lamentable Tragedie of that most Infortunate Prynce OEDIPVS, for thy profit rudely translated.

(oedipuspro:4r)

According to *OED*, the vocabulary item used in examples (45) and (46), *rudely*, has the semantic meaning “inexpert, unskilled” (*OED Online*, s.v. *rude* adj. and adv.). Notably, the form of items such as the ones in these examples is often such which could be double coded as both Appreciation of the translation and a Judgment of the translator. This double coding extends to other overlapping categories as well, as was seen above in example (35), where the expression *how farre aboue my powre, to keepe that grace, and maiestye of style, that Seneca doth* can be read as evaluating both the translator and translation. This overlap in the objects of evaluative language is especially prominent in the expressions evaluating the translator and translation, although some examples of author – main text overlap were found as well.

While the prototypical evaluation of the translation has so far manifested through negatively inscribed Appreciation, other types of Appraisal are used in connection to the translation as well. As the *thyrty yere labour* by the author in example (26) above is used as an indication of quality and effort put into the main text, opposing statements on the time spent in translation can be interpreted as evaluating the translation negatively:

- (47) I haue reduced it into english, I feare me, with more hast then good speede, not hauing spent full fiue weekes there abouts, as you very well know.

(boconstded: 2v)

In example (47) we again enter the area of ideational meaning, the interpretation of which as evaluation, according to White (2001b), is dependent on the reader’s attitudinal positioning. Like example (26) above, this example has an item of inscribed Appraisal in the immediate context to indicate the attitudinal positioning the reader is expected to adopt in terms of the evaluation. In this case, the item of Appraisal, *feare*, is part of the subcategory of Affect, or the group of items which expresses feelings and reactions to stimuli. However, in this context the item does not actually refer to the feeling of fear, but rather of uncertainty (*OED Online*, s.v. *fear* v.). This of course is a negative emotion, and hence the Appreciation evoked is

also negative, and a part of the modesty formula necessary for the paratextual genre. Indeed the practice of expressing fear when facing the challenges of the work is a pre-Christian tradition revived in the later Middle Ages (Curtius 1990: 83-84). The fact that the item of Affect can be analyzed as insincere due to its frequency of use and formulaic appearances in similar constructions is considered immaterial to the conclusion; the negative Appreciation has been evoked, whether or not the reader is aware of the frequent use of insincerity in modesty expressions of the genre.

In comparing the evoked Appreciation of example (26) to that of example (47), it should be noted that while the positive evaluation of the first concentrates on the main text, the negative evaluation in the latter evaluates the translation. Therefore these items can be viewed as somewhat formulaic expressions of quality directly derived, by the contemporary reader, from the object of evaluation (main text or translation) and the indicators of time spent on the work.

Another frequent theme in the paratexts studied is the acquittance of the translator from the responsibility of having produced substandard work. Example (48) contains an item demonstrating this tendency:

- (48) neyther haue I taken thys worke first in hand, as once ente{n}ding it shoulde come to light (of well doing whereof I vtterly dispayred) and being done but for mine owne priuate excercyse.
(troadespro: 3v)

In example (48), the reference to the purpose of the work (*mine owne priuate excercyse*) is foregrounded by a direct statement on the involuntariness of its public consumption (*neyther [...] ente{n}ding it shoulde come to light*). Both expressions evoke negative Appreciation of the work as substandard, while the message is strengthened through negative coloring in the form of authorial Affect (*I vtterly dispayred*). While example (48) contains two expressions evoking negative Appraisal of the work, the latter of these has a second function as well. *[M]ine owne priuate excercyse* immediately excuses this negative Appreciation on the quality of the translation through the claim on intended purpose of the work. The structure of

negative Appreciation of the translated work being evoked and excused in the same expression is repeated in example (49):

- (49) For I to no other ende remoued hym from his naturall and loftye Style to our corrupt & base, or as al men affyrme it: most barbarous Language: but onely to satisfye the instant requestes of a fewe my familiar frendes, who thought to haue put it to the very same vse, that Seneca hymself in his Inuention pretended:

(oedipusded: 2r-2v)

Example (49) replicates the process presented in connection to example (48) in implying familial or at least a close circle of friends as intended recipients and readers (*to satisfye the instant requestes of a fewe my familiar frendes*). The more fascinating and blatantly positive Appraisal evoked through the expression lies in the implication that a third party has already evaluated the translated work good enough to prompt publication of a text originally intended for private use. This strongly positive Appraisal is in direct contrast with the previous tone of the discourse, which is clearly negative. It is the expression of this non-authorial positive Appraisal – a mere report, and likely an unreliable one – which evokes the positive Appreciation of the work. Similar expression of motivation for publication can be found in other paratexts studied as well (e.g. *troadepro*: 3v). Whether these modest claims of positive evaluations by third parties were sincere or merely formal features of the paratext is uncertain. However, this theme of friends' requests as a motivation for the release of the translation is a common topic in the paratextual genre indeed (CCP 2012). Studies into paratexts and MT show that the statement of working as per request was one of the features of classics copied into the literature of the later Middle Ages (Curtius 1990: 85; Saenger 2006: 55-56).

Besides the relatively straightforward methods of inscribing or evoking evaluation described so far, the translator could also use different devices to indicate evaluations in order to appear more subtle. One of the more complex constructions of Appraisal includes items which are constructed so as to present a positive evaluation through or following a negative one, or vice versa. Similar items were already seen above in examples such as (32) and (37), discussing inscribed Appreciation (*AFter [...]*

tryfeles of mytth & p[a]tau{n}ce / [...] Now mynded to excercise my pen{n}e in mater to the redesom what more {pro}fyttable; remoued hym from his naturall and loftye Style to our corrupt & base). One further example of Appreciation created through coloring and levels of culturally evoked evaluation will be addressed below, so as to better explicate the possibilities of such comparisons:

- (50) For the whiche cause, so muche the rather haue I suffred this my base tra{n}slated Tragedie to be publyshed: from his Author in worde and Uerse far transformed, though in Sense lytell altred: and yet oftentimes rudely encreased with myne owne symple Inue{n}tion more rashly I co{n}fes than wysely, wyshyng to please all: to offende none:
(oedipuspro: 6v)

Example (50) contains a variety of devices of Appraisal. The extract opens with negative authorial Affect (*suffred*) and an inscribed negative Appreciation of the translation (*this my base tra{n}slated Tragedie*). After this signposting of the position taken by the translator, additional evaluation is evoked. The evoked Appreciation can be witnessed in the underlined expressions of example (50). The first item, *from his Author in worde and Uerse far transformed*, conveys an evoked negative Appreciation of the text, including one of the very few heightened items of Gradation of negative Appraisal in the material (*far*). The previous coloring aids the reader in identifying the evoked evaluation as negative, and the cultural context of the expression and current views on translation strengthen the interpretation (see Hermans 1985; Morini 2006 or section 2.3 of this thesis). However, in the next sentence the evaluation is countered positively through the counter-expectancy indicator (*though*), signposting the change in the direction of the evaluation. The counter-expectancy indicator is then followed by a positively toned evaluation (*in Sense lytell altred*). This expression, again, is identified as positive through the understanding of the contemporary views of translation, which demanded the meaning of the translated text be preserved. These expressions, although not explicitly stating an evaluation, show an awareness of the current styles and demands of translation. Indeed the translator is giving his assurances to the reader as to the quality of the translation, through application of the formula contrasting translation

of vocabulary to that of meaning, as presented in section 2.3 above. The interpretation of these sentences as evaluative is strengthened by the context of the expression, which continues with inscribed evaluative items (*rudely, rashly, wysely*). The full meaning of this extract is hence revealed through a collection of inscribed and evoked evaluative expressions demanding multiple levels of semantic and cultural knowledge from the reader. The understanding of the contemporary views of the translation allows the reader to view the extract as contrasting the original text with the translated one, although the main text is never explicitly evaluated within the extract. Assuming that the reader shares enough cultural background with the writer they still have the opportunity to reject the positive Appreciation evoked with *though in Sense lytell altred*, which is offered as a justification of the negative coloring surrounding the extract.

The last issue addressed here as a part of evoked evaluation of the translation is the act of dedicating. The evaluative meaning evoked by the presence of the patron in the paratext is introduced through examples (51) and (52). First, example (51) containing the title to the dedication of Heywood's translation of Seneca's *Troades* is given as an introduction to the topic:

- (51) ¶TO THE MOST HIGH and verteouse princesse, Elyzabeth by the grace of god Queene of England, Fraunce, and Ireland defender of the faith her highnes most humble and obedient subiect[e] Iasper Heywood student in the vniuersite of Oxford wissheth helth welth, honour, & felicitie.
(troadesded: 2r)

While this paratext title contains evaluations of the dedicatee, such as the inscribed positive Judgment (*vertuouse*), the evaluation of the book evoked by the title is far more dependent on the purely factual issues related to the dedicatee. Through expressions such as *THE MOST HIGH and verteouse princesse* and *Queene of England, Fraunce, and Ireland defender of the faith*, the dedication shown in example (51) evokes a positive evaluation of the work by the translator: Heywood has clearly considered his work suitable to be presented to the Queen. Both secular and religious titles exist to reflect the status of the dedicatee.

Besides the mention of the dedicatee in the title of the paratext, the dedicatory text returns to the dedicatee intermittently as a device evoking positive Appraisal of the book. Example (52) below contains items evoking Appreciation of the work through the mention of the dedicatee:

- (52) I thought it should not be vnpleasant for your grace to se some part of so excellent an author in your owne tong (the reading of whom in laten I vnderstande delightes greatly your maiesty) as also for that none may be a better iudge of my doinges herein, then who best vnderstandeth my author: and the authoritie of your graces fauour towarde thys my little worke, may be to measure defence and shield[e] against the sting of reprehending to{n}gues.

(troadesded: 3r)

The positive evaluation of the work in example (52) is achieved through multiple levels of Appraisal: inscribed non-authorial Affect (*it should not be vnpleasant for your grace*), inscribed positive Appreciation of the author (*excellent*), and through establishing previous enjoyment of the author by the Queen through a further statement of non-authorial Affect of extremely strong Graduation (*delightes greatly your maiesty*). The sequence of positive evaluation ends in another item of evoked positive Appreciation (*who best vnderstandeth my author*), through the implication of the dedicatee having already spent a number of hours familiarizing herself with the author's work. Even the English language gets its share of the overwhelming positivity, as its status is elevated through the connection to the Queen (*your owne tong*). In sum, it could be stated that rather than the evaluation of the dedicatee, it is the use and reuse of the dedicatee's presence in the paratextual matter which is considered central in evoking positive evaluations of the work in the mind of the reader. For this reason, the evaluation of the dedicatee was not addressed below in section 5.2 with the other actors, but as an example of evoked evaluation of the book here in section 5.1.2.

Additionally, it should be noted that the sequence of evoked positive Appreciation of the book in examples (51) and (52) creates great contrast to previously discussed examples (35), (38), and (48). These three examples – all from the prologue to the

same work – present evoked negative Appreciation of the style of the translation (*how farre aboue my powre, to keepe that grace, and maiestye of style*) and the work as a whole (*done but for mine owne priuate excercyse*), as well as inscribed negative Appreciation of the exemplar (*corrupt, euill*). Hence the evaluations of the book within prologue are strongly negative, while the dedication contains evoked positive items. This is perhaps due to the reciprocal status of the process of dedicating. As noted in section 2.3, the writer gained authority through the dedicatee, and in turn, flattered them, validating their high societal status (Binns 1996: 7). This exchange would have suffered from negative evaluations of the book, coloring the discourse. Indeed while the translator could be a target of negative Appreciation within the dedicatory discourse, a negative evaluation of the book while implying an enjoyment of the main text by the dedicatee would have been completely against the purpose of the textual form.

In sum, the evaluation of the work of translation is an extremely common topic of Appraisal in the sixteenth-century paratexts. The translator is, of course, writing the paratext, so it is understandable that evaluative language regarding the translation is common. The translation is typically evaluated negatively. Where positive Appreciation appears, it is most often evoked, and even the evoked items of positive Appreciation may contain layers of negative meaning on the syntactic level, contrasted by the positive meaning of the expression in the cultural context. The evaluation of the translation is equally prominent in both prologues and dedications, as no true differences in distribution were found in the division of evaluative language between the genres. A further study into the differences of distribution of positive and negative Appreciation of the translation might shed further light into the practice.

This section of the thesis has focused on the types and forms of inscribed and evoked Appreciation of the book in sixteenth-century translator's prologues and dedications. The examples have shown the variability of the topics evaluated and the range of complexity in the evaluative expressions. The positive expressions of Appreciation mainly deal with the main text, while the negative concentrate on other publications, the translation, or on some rare occasions, the exemplar. Many of the expressions are

extremely formulaic, if not in wording, then in theme. Notably, the positively formulaic evaluations of author or work also commonly contained heightened Graduation, whereas the inscribed negative evaluations of the translation –equally formulaic –did not. Finally it should be noted that the most important differentiation between the prologue and dedication in terms of evaluative expressions related to the book is the presence of dedicatee. Through the dedicatee, positive coloring has an effect on any evoked evaluation of the work, influencing the reader to view the text positively.

5.2. Evaluation of the actors within paratext

This section is to explore the evaluation of the people present in the production process of the book. As noted in the beginning of the analysis, the significance of this section relies on the claim that the Judgment of the relevant actors and the Appreciation of their entities, associated with the book, aims to influence the way a reader understands the work. In essence, evoked and inscribed Judgment and Appreciation of people are used as a way of producing Appreciation of the work itself. This application of the AF is of course dependent on the point of view of the study, as not all Judgment is Appreciation, and not all Appreciation is Judgment. However, all statements of evaluation echo further evaluations of other objects associated with the original.

The actors accepted as starting point of analysis are the author – or the person credited for the authorship – and the translator. There are other visible personas in the paratexts as well, such as the reader, who is often directly addressed in the prologue, but not included as a part of the analysis as they are not a part of the process of production. The second of the visible actors left out of the analysis is the dedicatee. In the previous section, in discussing the dedicatee used as a device of evoked Appreciation, it was shown that their presence in the paratext is important indeed when considering the ways in which the book is portrayed positively or negatively. However, expressions evaluating the dedicatee cannot be viewed as evaluative of the work. It was shown above that although there exists a great quantity of evaluative expressions on the dedicatees found in the material, it is not the

evaluation of the patron which gives the book extra value but the factual information given about them.

The writer is aware of this extra boost in status their work receives. Enenkel (2008: 42) has “discovered a certain ratio between the quantity of the praise and the actual relationship of the author with the dedicatee. The praise is stronger when the actual relationship between the author and the dedicatee is weaker.” The translator, understanding the evaluative function of the dedication, and acknowledging the inequality of the trade in dedicating, compensates for the inequality through explicitly positive evaluative language. The presence and status of the dedicatee, and the social and political distance between dedicatee and dedicator are what evokes the positive evaluation of the literary work in the mind of the contemporary reader. Hence, the analysis of the evaluation of the book through the evaluation of the dedicatee does not fit the profile of analysis conducted here. The purpose of the evaluation of author and translator, however, is far more explicitly evaluative of the work, and will be discussed in some detail in subsections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 respectively.

5.2.1. Author

As Martin and White (2005: 58) indicate, the most immediately visible items of inscribed Appraisal of the author are adjectival. For example, in the material of this thesis, the author of the main text is praised as *vertuouse*, *excellent* or *vvorthie*, (mortmanded: 2v, 4r; survvorlded: 2v; troadespro 3v; etc.). The most common single item of Attitude in connection to the author is by far the adjective *excellent*, (apophthpro: 2r; troadespro: 3r; etc.). Some items of adjectival evaluation have been given in context, in examples (53) through (55) below.

(53) of the whole werke of Apophthegmes by the right excellente clerke
Erasmus:

(apophthpro: 2r)

- (54) I haue (to proue my selfe) pryuatly taken & part which pleased me best.
of so excellent an auctor, for better is time spe{n}t in the best then
other,

(troadespro: 3v)

- (55) vnderstanding how greatly your highnes is delighted in the swete sappe
of fine and pure writers,

(troadesded: 2v-3r)

Much like when discussing the first examples of Appraisal in subsection 5.1.1, these evaluative items do not contain much substance, besides the inscribed, positively-toned evaluation (*excellente*, *excellent*, *best*, *fine*, *pure*). Notably, in inscribed evaluations of authors, these abstract evaluative lexemes (*excellent*, *fine*) collocate strongly with the nouns referring to the occupations or professions of the authors (*clerke*, *auctor*, *writers*) (CCP 2012). Items (53) through (55) above could be categorized as Appreciation: the authors are neither judged according to their character nor actions, but as entities or professions (see White 2001a). Hence, while this type of evaluative commentary in connection to the author might not shed much additional light as to the reasons for the positive Appreciation of the author himself, it goes to show that one of the central evaluative arguments for the quality of the work is the general superiority of the original author. This rule applies to longer expressions of Appraisal as well. While items (56) through (58) below are slightly more complex, they are similarly abstract in their evaluation of the author.

- (56) so excellent a writer, hath past the reache of all imitation

(troadespro: 4r)

- (57) But for so much as he is accompted of all antiquitie, the olde writer, for
compendiousnesse and breuity in that he tooke in hand: sufficie{n}t it
shal be in prayse or authoritie to haue yealded to him his owne, & no
more.

(survvorlpro: 3v)

- (58) to set forth in englishe, thys present piece, of the flowre of all writers
Seneca,

(troadespro: 3v)

Examples (56) through (58) contain items of Appreciation consisting of phrases rather than single vocabulary items. Examples (56) and (57) contain an item of positively inscribed Appraisal in the context (*excellent, accompted*), again coloring the discourse, followed by the longer structures such as the inscribed Appreciation in item (56), *past the reache of all imitacion*. Example (58), however, contains an evoked positive Appreciation of the author constructed through metaphor (*flowre of all writers*), with no other evaluative items coloring the immediate context. This strategy of evoking Appraisal Martin and White (2005: 64-67) have listed amongst the options of signposting (see subsection 3.1.1.2).

So far the examples of evaluation of the author discussed in this section have all been markedly unspecific as to the exact object of evaluation. While examples (53) through (58) have been clearly evaluative of the author, the true interest of Appraisal study in this thesis lies in the evaluative expressions which are more specific in terms of the object of evaluation. It was found that while evaluation of the author through Appreciation did allow for items containing more specific object of evaluation, it was extremely uncommon in the material. First example of this was given in example (35), reproduced as example (59) below:

- (59) how farre aboue my powre, to keepe that grace, and maiestye of style,
that Seneca doth, when both so excellent a writer, hath past the reache of
 all imitacion, and also thys our englishe toong (as many thinke and I here
 fynde) is farre vnable, to compare with the latten

(troadespro: 4r)

- (60) how harde a thyng it is for me, to touche at full in all poyntes, the
 aucthoures minde, (being in many places very harde and doubtfull and
 the worke much corrupt by the defeaute of euill printed bookes)

(troadespro: 3v-4r)

These two are the only items in the material found containing Appreciation of the author through a specific feature or element, rather than an abstract expression of worth or quality. The first of the items, example (59), was discussed previously in section 5.1.2 as a double coded item in which the sentence structure does not fully allow for a definite classification. The item perfectly presents the syntactic ambiguity

resulting in overlap of evaluation of work and author. While the item can be seen as an inscribed Appreciation of the style of the work, here it is viewed as evaluating the author through inscribed positive Appreciation of their style (*grace, and maiestye of style that Seneca doth*). As discussed in connection to example (37) above, it should be further noted that in section 5.1.2, it is not only the author who is evaluated here, but also the language used.

The only other item specifically stating the author as the object of Appreciation can be seen in example (60). The author is criticized for being unclear (*harde and doubtfull*), in a move unlike any other in the material. The context of the item is familiar (*how harde a thyng it is for me, to touche at full in all poyntes, the aucthoures minde*), as discussing difficulties in translation through negative self-evaluations is common in the material (CCP 2012). The object of evaluation in this expression is less common, as the negative Appreciation is directed towards the author. Indeed, example (60) contains the only item of negative evaluation of the author found in the primary material.

It was far more common to inscribe or evoke evaluation through a specified characteristic in expressions evaluating authors using Judgment. As discussed in subsection 3.1.1.2, Judgment includes evaluation of a person, their actions and character. The material contains no examples of Judgment through actions taken, but some were found targeting character: the author is most commonly depicted as pious and erudite. Although references to nobility are common, they are not included in the study as they are equally likely to refer to status by birth. Some examples of Judgment relying on a specific characteristic of the author have been given below.

- (61) made by the vertuouse & noble prince Iohn{n} Picus Erle of Mirandula, [...] whose picture I wolde to god were in all noble mens Chambers, and his grace and vertues in theyr soules and maners.

(mortmanded: 4r)

- (62) Onely I do here alleadge out of them a few things written by my Author in his owne defence. And first whereas some men pretend he hath not handled this argument deuoutly enough in that hee applieth not places of holy scripture to his purpose: As he accepteth well of their admonition,

so his answere is that seeing he professeth himselfe herein no diuine, but
a philosopher, (yet a Christian philosopher) they ought to beare with him.
(boconstpro: 3r)

Examples (61) and (62) show the author positively evaluated for his pious nature. Although the inscribed Judgment of character in example (61) can be read as a more general evaluation through the items *grace* and *vertues*, the context of the items suggest otherwise (*OED Online*, s.v. *grace* n.; *OED Online*, s.v. *virtue* n.). These strongly collocating adjectives both have religious connotations, and appear in syntactic context of religious discourse. Hence the expression is read as inscribing positive Judgment of the author due to their devout character.

Example (62) evokes positive Judgment of the author through an intricate construction, the essence of which is actually rather the evaluation by author than by the translator. The extract begins with the translator establishing his support of the author's self-evaluation (*I do here alleadge [...] few things written by my Author in his owne defence*). Thus, by explicitly stating a dialogistic positioning supporting the author, the translator adopts the author's self-evaluations as Judgment of his own. After this, the translator moves on to paraphrase the said self-evaluation as a part of his own paratext. In the item underlined in example (62), the Judgment is evoked through counter-expectancy (*some men pretend*), again establishing his distance from the position of the critics, followed by the statement presenting the motivation of criticism (*deuoutly*).⁵ Hence, although the extract concludes in the acceptance of the criticism, the counter-expectancy indicators have already shown the attitudinal positioning of the writer to be positive.

As stated above, besides devoutness, the one other feature the author is commonly evaluated for is his work ethic or learnedness. Some examples are given below:

⁵ In the sixteenth century, the verb *pretend* did not have as strong a negative connotation as it does today. Rather, it was a more general term signifying actions such as to claim, state, or declare (*OED Online*, s.v. *pretend* v.).

- (63) Wondre not at the grosenes of the Style: neither yet accownt the Inuentours dylygence disgraced by the Translators negligence:

(oedipuspro: 4r)

- (64) But for so muche as he is accompted of all antiquitie, the olde writer, for compendiousnesse and breuity in that he tooke in hand: sufficie{n}t it shal be in prayse or authoritie to haue yealded to him his owne, & no more

(survvorlpro: 3v)

The evaluation opens with inscribed negative Appreciation of the style of the translated text (*grosenes*), followed by the positive Judgment of the author, which in example (63) is realized as *Inuentours dylygence*. The dichotomy of evaluation between the two items, from negative to positive, is signposted through the counter-expectancy indicator *yet*. The item of positive evaluation of the author is then further contrasted with a negative Judgment of the translator (*disgraced, negligence*).

In the second item of Judgment, example (64), the positive evaluation of the author is twofold. The extract begins with the item of inscribed positive Judgment *accompted*, which as a variant spelling of *account*, meaning “valued” or “appreciated” (*OED Online*, s.v. *account* v.). However, as this Judgment is reported, it must be classified as non-authorial. It is seen as coloring the following discourse positively, rather than acting as an actual item of evaluation in itself. The latter item of evaluation in example (64), a positive Judgment of the author through the characteristics of *compendiousnesse and breuity*, is similarly non-authorial, but can be seen as evoking positive Judgment of the author through the dialogistic positioning of the translator, seen as gaining strength from the nameless figures of *antiquitie*. The extract closes in an extremely positively toned inscribed Appreciation of the author (*sufficie{n}t it shal be in prayse or authoritie to haue yealded to him his owne, & no more*).

In sum, although Appraisal of the author appears in varied forms, as evoked or inscribed Judgment or Appreciation, there were some principles found as to the contents and forms of the evaluations. When evaluating the author as an entity (Appreciation), the topic of evaluation is generally the abstract superiority of the

author, while expressions evaluating the actions or character of the author (Judgment) concentrate on a relatively limited number of issues such as religion or work ethics. All in all, abstract statements of quality are by far the most common evaluative statement in connection to the author.

Evaluation of the author appears mostly in prologues. Although there were instances, as exemplified by items (55) and (61), where the author was evaluated within the dedication, these items were rare, and tied to the evoked evaluation of the book through the patron (see section 5.1.3). In sum, evaluation of the author was accomplished through the presence of the patron or through the abstract expression of skill or character of the author.

5.2.2. Translator

Besides the author, the other actor heavily and explicitly evaluated in these paratexts is the translator. As noted above, the evaluation of the translator and translation is natural in these paratextual genres, as the prologues and dedications studied were produced by the translators themselves.

Most of the self-evaluations of the translator can be described through a rough division of the items into two major thematic categories. The first of these rough categories concentrates on expressions evaluating the translator through their skills, knowledge, or work ethics. The second contains the items of straightforward evaluation of character. The first of these categories is exemplified by the items (65) and (66) below.

- (65) I haue labou[r]ed to discharge the duetie of a translatour, that is, kepyng and folowyng the sense of my booke, to interprete and turne the Latine into Englyshe with as mucche grace of our vulgare tounge, as in my slendre power and knowelage hath lyen:

(apothpro: 2v)

- (66) Wherefore I requyre all them that shall rede it / or that hereth it redde / for to holde for excused my lytell and obscure vnderstandynge.

(olycastyded: 6r)

Examples (65) and (66) contain items of inscribed negative Appreciation of the translator. The expressions of skill and knowledge as a point of evaluation of the translator are typically accomplished through Appreciation, such as in the examples above. Both of these expressions exist to present a formulaic apology for the poor standard of work (see Saenger 2006: 55). As a part of the MT tradition, they neutralize criticism. More importantly, they express an Engagement of the translator through the acknowledgement of the possibility of error (see section 3.1.2 of this thesis). The expressions of explicitly negative Appreciation in examples (65) and (66) are a part of humility discourse, much like the Judgment following:

- (67) Wondre not at the grosenes of the Style: neither yet accownt the Inuentours dylygence disgraced by the Translators negligence: Who thoughe that he hath somtymes boldly presumed to erre fro{m} his Author, rouynge at Randon where he lyst: adding and subtracting at pleasure: Yet let not that engendre disdainful suspicion with in thy learned brest. Marke thou rather what is ment by the whole course of the Historie:

(oedipuspro: 4r)

Item (67) is a stereotypical evaluation of the translator through his work ethic. The example contains first two items of inscribed negative Judgment (*disgraced*, *negligence*), which are then followed by an elaboration: an evoked negative Judgment of the translator, *Who thoughe that he hath somtymes boldly presumed to erre fro{m} his Author, rouynge at Randon where he lyst: adding and subtracting at pleasure*. This negative Judgment is again superficially neutral, depending on the ideational meaning as well as the coloring by the previous inscribed Judgment in construing the evaluation. The Judgment portrays the ideal translation as following the original, and the translator as an imitator of the author; a duty which gives possibility to a number of negative items of Judgment of the translator. Finally, through a counter-expectancy indicator *yet* the negative evaluation of the translator is prevented from coloring the discourse of the main text itself (*let not that engendre disdainful suspicion with in thy learned brest*). This piece of evaluative language presents a view into sixteenth-century quality translation, and translator. He was to keep to the meaning of the author – often discussed through lexeme *accuracy* – and

neither add nor delete from the main text (CCP 2012). Unsurprisingly, following the demands of the modesty topos, the translator was often evaluated as failing these requirements. Indeed Morini (2006: 9) suggests that despite the rhetoric, the Renaissance translators disregard the demands for accuracy, and “feel no qualms of conscience in doing so”.

Example (67) has shown how evaluative content targeting the translator was typically formed: concentrating on the translator’s work ethic. Further examples of this subject of evaluation can be seen below in items (68) and (69).

- (68) Lastly I haue with some more care and diligence of mine owne, reduced the summe of both bookes into a large and plaine table containing the argument of the whole conference vnder one viewe, the better to helpe thy memorie

(boconstpro: 3v)

- (69) And although vpon consideracions, (at a more propice tyme hereafter by goddes grace to bee declared) I haue bee{n} so bolde with myne autour, as to make the firste booke & secounde, whiche he maketh thirde and fourth[.] Yet in these twoo presente volumes whiche ye see here sette forth, I haue labou[r]ed to discharge the duetie of a translatour, that is, kepyng and folowyng the sense of my booke, to interprete and turne the Latine into Englyshe with as muche grace of our vulgare tounge, as in my slendre power and knowelage hath lyen: not omittyng ne leattyng passe, either any one of all the Apophthegmes as thei stand in ordre (except twoo or three at ye moste beeyng of suche sorte as honestee perswaded me, to bee better passed ouer, then rehersed or spoken of,)

(apothpro: 2r-2v)

The self-Judgment (*care and diligence*) in example (68) is perhaps one of the most explicit items of positive Appraisal of the translator in the material. Unlike most other items of Judgment of the translator, this expression is neither negative nor circumspect. Notably however, the act judged is not actually the act of translating, but the act of producing original content within the book; an additional peritext to help the reader in their use of the publication. Here we witness the major difference in the applicability of the MT tradition in the material by translators. Commonly studied from the point of view of the author as the producer of paratext, the MT

expressions target the original content and the author (Saenger 2006: 55). In paratexts by the translator studied here, the MT expressions target the translation and translator, while the original content is evaluated positively. Whether or not this is a general tendency of sixteenth-century paratextual matter remains to be seen, as there was only one item found in the material evaluating original content by the translator.

In comparison, example (69) is relatively complex, and bears quoting in length. It contains multiple levels of evaluation. The first item of Judgment is a negative one, evoked by the lexeme *bolde*, indicating poor judgment or rash decision making. The reason for the evoked Judgment follows, and the (relatively mild) negative evaluation presents a Judgment of the translator based on the changes he has made to the structure of the original work. The following evoked positive Judgment is triggered the counter-expectancy indicator *yet*, and later evoked in *I haue labou[r]ed to discharge the duetie of a translator*. As the counter-expectancy indicator links the two items of Judgment together, the negative evaluation of the first item (*I haue bee{n} so bolde with myne autour, as to make the firste booke & secounde, whiche he maketh thirde and fourth[.]*) is softened considerably. The final piece of evaluation, *my slendre power and knowelage*, was discussed above as example (65), as an item of negative Appreciation of the translator as a skilled worker. This combination of negative and positive Judgment and Appreciation can largely be explained through the tradition of MT, which does not allow the writer to evaluate their own work positively – at least not explicitly (see section 2.3 of this thesis). The central message here is situated in the sentence *I haue labou[r]ed to discharge the duetie of a translator*, which stresses the responsibilities and demands placed on the translator, evoking him positively without breaking the tradition of MT. The traditional expression of the work being intended for private use would be in opposition with the statements of the work being laborious. Hence no such claim is made. However, the possible criticism by the readers is countered by pre-emptively by presenting negative Appraisal of the actions and skills of the translator. The extract ends in an account of editorial principles, in *except twoo or three at ye moste beeyng of suche sorte as honestee perswaded me*. This admittance of shortcomings in connection to the skill needed to translate the main text in question is unique in the

material, as the MT expressions discussed so far were commonly repeated in content, if not in form, without reference to the specific text in question.

As noted in the start of this subsection, besides self-evaluations on the skills and knowledge of the translator (Appreciation), the paratexts also contains items of Judgment. These evaluate the translator's character. These types of evaluations are relatively few in the material.

- (70) among those ripe and curious wittes, that offer to your learned view
matter of valew, squared and leueld by deepe knowledge and experience:
a simple zealous man, more deuoted in affection to your honors welfare,
then able to expresse the same as other can⁶

(palenglded: 2r)

- (71) Ther is in this behalf no mannes labour lost but myne, and ye[t] not that
all lost neither, if my good zele & honest entente to dooe good to all
sortes, bee in good parte interpreted and accepted.

(apophthpro: 2v-3r)

Example (70) presents *a simple zealous man*, whereas the translator of example (71) is motivated by his *good zele & honest entente to dooe good*. The vocabulary of these inscribed items of positive Judgment is simple and unassuming, and some of the adjectives (*simple*, *honest*) are commonly repeated in connection to the description of the translation itself (CCP 2012). For example, the lexeme *simple* exists, in the context of the translation, to create a mildly negative evaluation (see subsection 5.1.3). The structure of the items of Judgment is similar, as both open with a mildly pessimistic representation of context either contrasting the translator with those of better ability (*among those ripe and curious wittes*, [...] *a simple zealous man*) or appearing to present a dialogistic position preparing for negative reception of the work (*no mannes labour lost but myne*). The inscribed positive

⁶ In the sixteenth-century context, *curious* refers to someone skillful, careful or fastidious. The lexeme hence contains strong positive connotations in its contemporary context. (Barber 1976: 153; *OED Online*, s.v. *curious* adj.).

Judgment of one's own character (*simple, honest*) and put-down of one's own work (*more deuoted [...] then able to expresse the same as other; Ther is in this behalf no mannes labour lost but myne*) follow. The Judgment in example (70), in specific, is moderated through the locating of the self-evaluation in direct contact with negative evoked Appreciation of own skills (*more deuoted in affection to your honors welfare, then able to expresse the same as other can*) and negative inscribed Appreciation of the work (*vnpullished peece of worke*). In both items this uncharacteristically positive inscribed Judgment of the translator is hence wrapped in negative evaluations and expressions of MT.

The duality of positive-negative evaluation in examples (70) and (71) is indeed one of the more intriguing findings within the material. While there are inscribed positive evaluations targeting the translator, they are limited in the forms of their manifestations. In other words, in the current material, the translator is positively evaluated for an extremely limited set of features and accomplishments. These positive evaluations are formulaic to the point of appearing rhetorical. The evoked evaluations of the translator, however, present the translator as a skilled worker, able to answer the demands of the MT, produce text in topical, high rhetoric style. – All the while promoting his work through positive evaluations obscured by the aforementioned negatively evaluative language.

The evaluation of all other objects studied in section 5.2 was found to be relatively evenly distributed between prologues and dedications, but the evaluation of translator is far more common in the paratextual genre of prologue. The few examples containing evaluation of self in dedications usually consist of one inscribed adjective or equally short expression of modification, whereas in prologues the evaluative expression might extend over several sentences. This result reflects that of section 5.1, where the evaluation of the translation was found to appear more prominently in prologues, whereas other types of expressions evaluating the book were rather evenly distributed between the paratextual genres.

5.3. Discussion

Having now presented the ways in which positively or negatively evaluative expressions related to the book are achieved in the sixteenth-century paratext, it is time to turn back to the research questions given in chapter 1. The purpose of this thesis was to study the positive and negative evaluation of the book in the sixteenth-century translators' prologues and dedications, in order to find the possible devices or regularities of evaluation. Additionally, where applicable, these evaluative expressions were connected to the context of the book's production in order to explore the contemporary attitudes towards the book.

The types of positively or negatively evaluative expressions in the paratextual material are formed using items of Judgment and Appreciation. Although there were evaluative items containing Affect in the material as well, these items were found to be mainly non-authorial and hence beyond the scope of the study (see subsection 3.1.1.1). The overwhelmingly prominent strategy of evaluation in the present material is Appreciation.

The typical examples of evaluation using Appreciation include either abstract, strongly positive complements of the book, or the positively toned evaluation of the contents, style, or effects the text has on its reader. While the surface level of these evaluative expressions seems to refer to the book as a whole, in fact no evaluative expressions were found targeting the whole book; the translation has been excluded from the evaluation. Indeed, the evaluation of the translation is clearly separate from the other types of evaluations of the book, as the translation is the only area of the book which is consistently the object of negative Appreciation. Instances of negative Appreciation of the other components of the book are extremely rare and only appear in special cases, such as in the epitextual evaluation of another work or in comparisons aiming to gain additional value for the main text.

Appreciation of the book can be either evoked or inscribed. Both strategies of construing Appreciation are common in the material. Overall, positive Appreciation was more frequently evoked, whereas negative was inscribed. The positive evoked Appreciation is achieved through circumspect expressions colored by previous

inscribed items of Appraisal, metaphors, contrasts, or counter-expectancy indicators. Negative Appreciation, on the other hand, was more commonly presented as inscribed. Indeed the dedicatory genre in specific has previously been described as a genre praising the patron and criticizing the author – or in this case, the translator (Saenger 2006: 55). The negatively evaluative expressions usually targeted the translation, and as the demands of the MT dictated the negative evaluation of the translator's work, it was sensible to express such obligatory genre features explicitly. While there were instances of positive Appreciation in connection to the translation, these messages were commonly accomplished in a more circumspect manner. The inscribed items of evaluation in reference to the main text were extremely formulaic.

Appreciation or Judgment of the actors present in the process of book production was also a common strategy of the Appraisal of the book. It was found that while there are three actors relevant for the purposes of this study, only two of these should be analyzed through AF as pertinent examples of the evaluation of the book. The three actors are the author, translator, and dedicatee. While all three are subject to frequent and explicit evaluations, the dedicatee was considered influencing the reading through the mention of their name rather than through the evaluation of their actions or character. This finding supports Saenger's (2006: 55) view of dedication acting as a "demonstration of the author's courtliness and familiarity of high speech and high society", or in other words, of the dedication as a way of positioning the dedicator in regards to the dedicatee. Therefore, the evaluative expressions related to dedicatees were not accepted as comparable to the evaluative expressions dealing with the other two actors.

In the expressions evaluating the author and translator, it was found that the overall tendency in the evaluative discourse was to evaluate authors positively, and translators negatively. The evaluation of the translator has taken on the form and roles usually assigned to the author. Genette (1997: 198) notes on the necessity of these roles in connection to MT, saying that expressing a too positive evaluation of the author, or in this case the translator, would serve to antagonize the reader unnecessarily. Hence, the general tone of evaluation of the translator is somewhat ambiguous, following the traditional style of evaluation of the author, while the

evaluation of the author is pushed, so to speak, into a position unknown to Genette's paradigm.

Typically, the evaluation of the author was achieved through a relatively empty expression of inscribed quality, or by referring to the author's religious or hard-working nature. Other characteristics of authors were rarely praised, and negative evaluations were extremely rare. Although it can be tentatively stated that the general tendency was to use items of Appreciation to state the general quality of the author, by attaching the qualifier to a noun referring to a job title or profession, and that Judgment was only used in formulaic expressions in reference to the character of the author, the items of Judgment especially are far too few to draw any generalized conclusion based on this finding. Hence it must suffice to say that Appreciation is a far more versatile strategy for expressing evaluation of the author, and that there is a number of positively toned, formulaic expressions applied mechanically to the description of the author, perhaps indicating that the evaluation of the author was more important as a counterpoint to the modesty expressions than as truly evaluative discourse directing the reader's attention.

The MT expressions were an important part of the evaluation of the translator. As noted above, the translator was commonly evaluated negatively. If there were positive evaluations of the translator, they were usually achieved through circumspect constructions: for example, positive evaluations were situated in the middle of otherwise negatively toned discourse. The translator was positively evaluated for their good intentions, or their pious or hardworking nature, but never for their skill in the literary arts. This finding corresponds to Genette's (1997: 198) notes on the evaluation of the author, who was not to be evaluated for their talent. In the context of the sixteenth-century material studied in this thesis, the Appreciation of skill was reserved for authors alone. However, the central finding of the study in terms of the representation of the translator was that while the translator could not be explicitly evaluated positively in connection to his work, he could give an impression of himself as a skilled laborer through evoked items of Appraisal (see subsection 5.2.2 of this thesis). Through negative evaluations, MT, and formulaic expressions dating back to the classics, the translator was communicating his literariness, skill

and educational background simply by following the demands of the paratextual genre in terms of the evaluative discourse. The awareness of the demands of the genre can be seen in items such as example (65), where the translator notes that he has *labou[r]ed to discharge the duetie of a translator* (apothpro: 2v).

The distribution of evaluative expressions between the two paratextual genres studied was not unambiguous. Although almost any type of evaluative expression could be found from either paratextual genre, some patterns of use emerged nevertheless. First and foremost, the dedicatee was not a part of the evaluation of the book in prologue. In fact, the dedicatee was usually not even mentioned in the prologues of the material. Considering the widely differing (intended) readerships of the paratextual genres it can hence be assumed that the main purpose of the dedicatee as an evaluative element is exhausted in the dedicatory expression. It would be redundant to return to the dedicatee within the prologue which is after all directly addressed to very a different readership.

Additionally, the genres of dedication and prologue were found differing in the distribution of the evaluative expressions related to the author and the translator. Simply put, the evaluation of the authors and translators is more common in the prologue than in the dedication. In the cases in which the author was evaluated within the dedication, the evaluative expression gained value from the dedicatee, rather than from the quality of the author. In the instances where the translator is evaluated within the dedication, the evaluative expression relates to the translator's character, and not to the more common topic of his skill, which is frequently negatively evaluated in the prologues. In sum, while the author and translator are evaluated in the dedication, these evaluative expressions are exceptions in terms of the theoretical framework applied in this thesis.

It was found that while the simplest items of Appraisal may express the evaluation through a single word, the analysis of those items is strongly influenced by the syntactic and cultural context of the expression, and sometimes even by the demands of the genre. Evoked items were found equally complex. It could be stated that while there are some instances where the evaluation is inscribed and straightforward, the

demands of the MT as well as the traditions of the genre place strain on simple analysis of evaluative lexemes in historical context. Most items of Appreciation were found to contain multiple levels of meaning.

In sum, the expressions analyzed show that the contemporary attitudes towards the book demanded the ideal translation to have an excellent (unspecifically evaluated) author, honorable (as well-known as possible) patron and a modest translator; although translators could be immodest when the positive evaluation of self was surrounded by other negative constructions. The translator, as an object of evaluation, took on the role normally reserved for the author, while the role of the author was to be a target of visible and explicit, but rather empty expressions of positive evaluation. Out of the three actors, the translator was the one evaluated most often. He was also the only one of the three to be evaluated negatively.

The most typical evaluation of author (also of the book) in this material is the abstract assurance of quality; the author is good because he has been *previously* evaluated as good. This could be seen as reflecting the historical nature of book production. Manuscript production was a time consuming, expensive process demanding skilled labor, and the authors or books published were often well-known and repeatedly copied – the Bible being the ultimate prototype (e.g. Febvre and Martin 2010: 248-250). However, the author did not own his works, nor did he have the authority over his writing we consider as the very definition of authorship (Eisenstein [1979] 1980: 121-122). This meant that the few authors produced and reproduced were well-known classics, whose reputation was not dependent on the Appraisal of their skill in writing in the paratextual material. The general concept is repeated in the case of the dedicatee, whose value to the work as a promotional element is dependent on their name and previously established reputation.

The translated work itself was to be beneficial and sometimes pleasurable to the reader and to follow the original in content, although additions or subtractions were not excessively frowned upon. Indeed, Morini (2006: 9) claims a distinct lack of remorse in connection to changes made to the original – despite the rhetoric claiming otherwise. Additionally, the translation was to follow the original in style, and yet be

presented in flawless English. Notably, the characteristics of following the original in style and producing a good English translation were found to be mutually exclusive, as the English language was, by definition, in bad style. Additionally, the formulaic evaluation of the book was extremely common in positive and negative evaluations alike. Regardless of the exact object of evaluation (be it author, translator, the style of the work or the work itself), it was found that the paratexts contained a limited number of thematic elements used when evaluating the book. The evaluative items were found especially formulaic in the context of modesty discourse. This is seen as a verification of the claim that the repetitive nature of the negatively evaluative language is a necessary element of the paratextual genre. Bednarek (2006a: 200) has aptly named these representations of evaluative language *rhetorical-pragmatical* to reflect the conflict between surface structure and message.

Here the distinction between evoked and inscribed evaluation becomes significant. As noted above, evoked and inscribed items of evaluation commonly present contrasting evaluations, especially in the case of the translator. While the evaluation of the book, author, and the presence of the dedicatee are evaluated positively, the translation and translator are evaluated both positively and negatively, sometimes within the same paratext or even the same evaluative expression. This is because the contemporary demands on the translator did not allow them to explicitly evaluate themselves positively (Genette 1997: 198). Therefore the inscribed Appraisal of the translation and translator is considered the product of the modesty discourse, and the traditional evaluation of the author, whereas the evoked positive Appraisal exists to express the true evaluations of the translator and translation.

These results support the previously established importance of the modesty topos in analyzing early modern paratexts. They also suggest that there might be some benefit derived from comparing modesty topos expressions to other evaluative expressions in conducting Appraisal analysis on historical materials. MT expressions seem to be connected to the moroe genre specific evaluative expressions, and might shed further light the perceived differences between the inscribed and evoked expressions of Appraisal.

Indeed, it is the differentiation between inscribed and evoked items of evaluation which makes the AF such an effective tool in analyzing the historical materials in this thesis. Although the sheer detail of the framework makes it difficult to utilize in full, and the disjointed representation of it in publications is somewhat discouraging at first, in analyzing and categorizing the more implicit items of evaluation in this thesis, the framework has been indispensable. The identification of the more implicit items of Appraisal is necessary, for they have to be analyzed in order to draw conclusions on the material. Limiting the analysis to the inscribed items would have produced a study on the rhetoric, rather than on the attitudes towards the book.

6. Conclusion

This thesis has studied the evaluative expressions related to the book in a sample of sixteenth-century translators' paratexts. The purpose of the study was to find out how the evaluative message is conveyed, and what the evaluation reveals of the contemporary perceptions of the book. This was achieved through conducting a close reading of sixteen translators' paratexts, which were combed through to find the evaluative expressions, after which the evaluative language was analyzed using the Appraisal Framework developed by White (2001a; 2001b; etc.) and Martin and White (2005).

The current study connects to a growing pool of research into the linguistic representation of feeling and emotion based on SFL. The central benefit of the AF in terms of this study is the lexical approach, allowing for the analysis of implicit expression of emotion and opinion. As a part of studies applying AF, the one conducted here was among the few taking advantage of this possibility: previous studies have mainly concentrated on the analysis of inscribed items of Appraisal. However, although AF offered a unique opportunity for the study of the indirect ways of expressing opinion, the applicability of such a detailed framework to full-length texts proved challenging. More importantly, the amount of detail in the framework complicates the presenting and generalizing the results unnecessarily. In the end, only the surface structures of the theory were applied in this thesis.

It was found that while the evaluative expressions related to the book can be extremely varied in their forms and contents, the material does contain some regularities. The overwhelming majority of the evaluative items manifested through Appreciation, while the use of Judgment, as a form of evaluating the author or translator, was restricted to a limited number of situations, mainly including inscribed items evaluating the character of the author or translator positively. Further study would be necessary to ascertain if this tendency is common in the paratexts of the century, as the number of items of Judgment found in the material was indeed exceedingly small.

The form and content of items of Appreciation in the instances considered evaluative of the book were extremely diverse. A general tendency could be detected, dividing the positive and negative items of Appreciation to those targeting the author and main text, as well as translator and translation respectively. This tendency can perhaps best be explained through the demands of the MT, as for the sixteenth-century literary producer (author, translator or printer) it was not in good taste to evaluate oneself positively.

Although viewing evaluation of the translation and translator as manifestations of the modesty topos was found partially accurate in terms of the present material, a further specification should be made for the evaluative content revealed by the specific analytic opportunities offered by the Appraisal Framework. As noted above in chapter 3, the AF is a mainly lexically oriented approach, and allows for the study of the more implicit items of evaluation. The more implicit items evoking positive Appreciation of the translator were found rather more truthful representation of the way the translator viewed the work, whereas the formulaic items could be seen as mere demands of the genre. It would perhaps be beneficial, in later studies, to further focus on the differences between evoked and inscribed evaluation, so as to ascertain if the hypothesis on the differences of their application to rhetorical formula versus more sincere evaluations holds water.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

The Corpus of Sixteenth-Century Paratexts (CCP) 2012. Department of English, University of Turku. Compiled by Sirkku Ruokkeinen.

Secondary Sources

Anderson Randall 2002. The rhetoric of paratext in early printed books. In Barnard and McKenzie (eds): 636-644.

Armstrong Guyda 2007. Paratexts and their functions in seventeenth-century English Decamerons. *Modern Language Review* 102: 40-57.

Barber Charles 1976. *Early Modern English*. London: André Deutsch Limited.

Barnard John and McKenzie D. F. (eds) 2002. *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain*. VI: 1557-1695. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baron Sabrina Alcorn, Lindquist Eric N. and Shevlin Eleanor F. (eds) 2007. *Agent of Change: Print Culture Studies After Elizabeth L. Eisenstein*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Bednarek Monika 2006a. Evaluation and cognition: Inscribing, evoking and provoking opinion. In Pishwa (ed.): 187-221.

Bednarek Monika 2006b. *Evaluation in Media Discourse: Analysis of a Newspaper Corpus*. New York: Continuum.

Bednarek Monika 2009. Language patterns and attitude. *Functions of Language* 16 (2): 165-192.

Binns J. W. 1996. Printing and paratext in sixteenth-century England: The Oxford and Cambridge presses. *Cahiers Elisabéthains: Late Medieval and Renaissance English Studies* 50: 1-10.

Bossuyt Ignace, Gabriëls Nele and Sacré Dirk (eds) 2008. *Cui Dono Lepidum Novum Libellum: Dedicating Latin Works and Motets in the Sixteenth Century*. Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia XXIII. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Brayman Hackel Heidi 2005. *Reading Material in Early Modern England: Print, Gender and Literacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Burnley J. D. 1989. Late Medieval English translation: Types and reflections. In Ellis (ed.): 37-53.
- Conrad Susan and Biber Douglas [2000] 2001. Adverbial marking of stance in speech and writing. In Hunston and Thompson (eds): 56-73.
- Coulthard Malcom (ed.) [1994] 2005. *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Curtius Ernst Robert 1990. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Transl. Willard L. Trask. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Dam Harm-Jan van 2008. "Vobis pagina nostra dedicatur": Dedication in classical antiquity. In Bossuyt, Gabriëls and Sacré (eds): 13-34.
- Day Matthew 2011. 'Intended to offenders': The running titles of early modern books. In Smith and Wilson (eds): 34-47.
- Dunn Kevin 1994. *Pretexts of Authority: The Rhetoric of Authorship in the Renaissance Preface*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Early English Books Online 2013 [online]. Available: www.eebo.chadwyck.com. (28 March 2013).
- Eisenstein, Elizabeth L. [1979] 1980. *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early-Modern Europe*. Vols 1-2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eliot Simon and Rose Jonathan (eds) 2007. *The Companion to the History of the Book*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Ellis Roger (ed.) 1989. *The Medieval Translator: The Theory and Practice of Translation in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.
- Enenkel Karl 2008. Reciprocal authorization: The function of dedications and dedicatory prefaces in the 15th and 16th century 'Artes antiquitatis'. In Bossuyt, Gabriëls and Sacré (eds): 35-48.
- Febvre Lucien and Martin Henri-Jean 2010. *The Coming of the Book: The Impact of Printing 1450-1800*. Transl. David Gerard. London: Verso.
- Fox Alistair [1995] 1999. The complaint of poetry for the death of liberality: The decline of literary patronage in the 1590s. In Guy (ed.): 229-257.
- Genette Gérard 1997. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Transl. Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Guy John (ed.) [1995] 1999. *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday M. A. K. 1981. Introduction. In Halliday and Martin (eds): 13-16.
- Halliday M. A. K. and Martin J. R. (eds) 1981. *Readings in Systemic Linguistics*. London: Batsford Academic and Educational Ltd.
- Halliday M. A. K. and Matthiessen Christian M. I. M. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 3rd ed. London: Hodder Education.
- Hellinga Lotte 2007. The Gutenberg revolutions. In Eliot and Rose (eds): 207-219.
- Hermans Theo 1985. Images of translation: Metaphor and imagery in the Renaissance discourse on translation. In Hermans (ed.): 103-145.
- Hermans Theo (ed.) 1985. *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. London: Croom Helm.
- Hiltunen Risto 2012. Pragmatics meets paratexts: Early English prologues and epilogues. Paper presented at the 17th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics, Zürich, August 2012.
- Hunston Susan [1994] 2005. Evaluation and organization in a sample of written academic discourse. In Coulthard (ed.): 191-218.
- Hunston Susan and Thompson Geoff (eds) [2000] 2001. *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Janson Tore 1964. *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions*. Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis XIII. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wicksell.
- Kaltenbacher Martin 2006. Culture related linguistic differences in tourist websites: The emotive and the factual: A corpus analysis within the framework of the appraisal. In Thompson and Hunston (eds): 269-292.
- Lewis M. S. 2008. Introduction: The dedication as paratext. In Bossuyt, Gabriëls, and Sacré (eds): 1-11.
- Litzler Mary Frances 2011. *A Corpus of Middle English Medical Prologues in the Sloane Collection of the British Library: An Introduction to the Genre in Prose*. Gran Canaria: The University of Las Palmas.
- Macksey Richard 1997. Foreword. In Genette: xi-xxii.

- Martin J. R. 1995. Reading positions / positioning readers: Judgment in English. *Prospect: An Australian Journal of Teaching/Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages* 10: (2): 27-37.
- Martin J. R. [2000] 2001. Beyond exchange: Appraisal systems in English. In Hunston and Thompson (eds): 142-175.
- Martin J. R. 2003. Introduction. *Text* 23 (2): 171-181.
- Martin J. R. and White P. R. R. 2005. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Massai Sonia 2011. Editorial pledges in early modern dramatic paratexts. Smith and Wilson (eds): 91-106.
- Matthiessen F. O. 1931. *Translation: An Elizabethan Art*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- McConchie R. W., Timofeeva Olga, Tissari Heli and Säily Tanja (eds) 2006. *Selected Proceedings of the 2005 Symposium in New Approaches in English Historical Lexis*. Somerville: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Morini Massimiliano 2006. *Tudor Translation in Theory and Practice*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Oxford University Press 2013. *OED Online* [online]. Available: www.oed.com (23 March 2013).
- Pishwa Hanna (ed.) 2006. *Language and Memory: Aspects of Knowledge Representation*. Trends in Linguistics: Studies in Monographs 173. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rhodes Neil 2011. Status anxiety in English Renaissance translation. In Smith and Wilson (eds): 107-120.
- Richardson Brian 2009. *Manuscript Culture in Renaissance Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saenger Michael 2006. *The Commodification of Textual Engagements in the English Renaissance*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Shaw David J. 2007. The book trade comes of age: The sixteenth century. In Eliot and Rose (eds): 220-231.
- Sherman William H. 2007. On the threshold: Architecture, paratext, and early print culture. In Baron, Lindquist and Shevlin (eds): 67-81.

- Smith Helen and Wilson Louise (eds) 2011. *Renaissance Paratexts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steinberg S. H. 1996. *Five Hundred Years of Printing*. Revised by John Trevitt. London: Oak Knoll Press & The British Library.
- Suhr Carla 2011. *Publishing for the Masses: Early Modern English Witchcraft Pamphlets*. Helsinki: Société néophilologique.
- The Corpus of Sixteenth-Century Paratexts (CCP)* 2012. Department of English, University of Turku. Compiled by Sirkku Ruokkeinen.
- Thomas Donald 1969. *A Long Time Burning: The History of Literary Censorship in England*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Thompson Geoff 2004. *Introducing Functional Grammar*. 2nd ed. London: Arnold.
- Thompson Geoff and Hunston Susan [2000] 2001. Evaluation: An introduction. In Hunston and Thompson (eds): 1-27.
- Thompson Geoff and Hunston Susan (eds) 2006. *System and Corpus: Exploring Connections*. London: Equinox.
- Timofeeva Olga 2006. Word be worde – andgit of andgite: A study of the Medieval rhetorical formula. In McConchie et al. (eds): 135-142.
- Voss Paul J. 1998. Books for sale: Advertising and patronage in late Elizabethan England. *Sixteenth Century Journal* 29 (3): 733-756.
- White P. R. R. 2001a. An introductory tour through appraisal theory [online]. Available:
www.grammatics.com/appraisal/AppraisalOutline/AppraisalOutlineWPFiles.html (9 October 2012).
- White P. R. R. 2001b. Appraisal: An overview [online]. Available:
www.grammatics.com/appraisal/AppraisalGuide/AppraisalGuideWPFiles.html (9 October 2012).
- White P. R. R. 2001c. Attitude/Affect [online]. Available:
www.grammatics.com/appraisal/AppraisalGuide/AppraisalGuideWPFiles.html (9 October 2012).
- White P. R. R. 2001d. Attitude/Judgment [online]. Available:
www.grammatics.com/appraisal/AppraisalGuide/AppraisalGuideWPFiles.html (9 October 2012).

- White P. R. R. 2001e. Attitude/Appreciation [online]. Available: www.grammatics.com/appraisal/AppraisalGuide/AppraisalGuideWPFiles.html (9 October 2012).
- White P. R. R. 2001f. Intertextual positioning [online]. Available: www.grammatics.com/appraisal/AppraisalGuide/AppraisalGuideWPFiles.html (9 October 2012).
- White P. R. R. 2001g. Engagement and dialogistic positioning [online]. Available: www.grammatics.com/appraisal/AppraisalGuide/AppraisalGuideWPFiles.html (9 October 2012).
- Williams Franklin B. Jr. 1962. *Index of Dedications and Commendatory Verses in English Books Before 1641*. London: The Bibliographical Society.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Full table of primary texts

Year of pub.	STC	Title	Author	Translator	Dedication short title	Prologue short title
1500	24766	<i>Here begynneth the lyf of saint katherin of senis the blessid virgin</i>	Raymond, of Capua	n/a		lyfsaintpro
1518	18808	<i>[Here endeth ye hystorye of Olyuer of Castylle, and of the fayre Helayne]</i>	n/a	Watson, Henry	olycastyded	
1528	13436	<i>The vertuose boke of distyllacyon of the waters of all maner of herbes with the fygyres of the styllatoryes, fyrst made and compyled by the thyrte yeres study and labour of the moste co[n]nyng and famous mayster of phisyke, Master Iherom bruynswyke.</i>	Brunschwig, Hieronymus	Andrew, Laurence		bokdistypro
1534	6157	<i>A svvete and deuoute sermon of holy saynt Ciprian of mortalitie of man</i>	St Cyprian	Eliot, Thomas	mortmanded	
		<i>The rules of a christian lyfe made by Picus erle of Mirandula</i>		Eliot, Thomas		mortmanpro
1542	10443	<i>Apophthegmes that is to saie, prompte, quicke, wittie and sentencious saiynge, of certain emperours, kynges, capitaines, philosophiers and oratours, aswell Grekes, as Romaines, bothe veraye pleasaunt [et] profitable to reade, partely for all maner of persones, [et] especially gentlemen</i>	Rotterdamian, Erasmus	Udall, Nicholas		apophthpro
1559	22227a	<i>The sixt tragedie of the most graue and prudent author Lucius, Anneus, Seneca, entituled Troas with diuers and sundrye addicions to the same</i>	Seneca, Lucius Annaeus	Heywood, Jasper	troadesded	troadespro

1563	22225	<i>The lamentable tragedie of Oedipus the sonne of Laius Kyng of Thebes out of Seneca</i>	Seneca, Lucius Annaeus	Neville Alexander	oedipusded	oedipuspro
1572	6901	<i>The surueye of the vworld, or situation of the earth, so muche as is inhabited Comprysing briefly the generall partes thereof, with the names both new and olde, of the principal countries, kingdoms, peoples, cities, towns, portes, promontories, hils, woods, mountains, valleyes, riuers and fountains therin conteyned. Also of seas, with their clyffes, reaches, turnings, elbows, quicksands, rocks, flattes, shelues and shoares. A work very necessary and delectable for students of geographie, saylers, and others</i>	Dionysius, Periegetes	Twyne, Thomas	survvorloded	survvorlpro
1588	5541	<i>The famous, pleasant, and variable historie, of Palladine of England Discoursing of honorable aduentures, of knightly deedes of armes and chiualrie: enterlaced likewise with the loue of sundrie noble personages, as time and affection limited their desires</i>	Colet, Claude	Monday, Anthony	palenglded	palenglpro
1595	15695	<i>Tvvo bookes of constancie. Written in Latine, by Iustus Lipsius. Containing, principallie, A comfortable conference, in common calamities. And will serue for a singular consolation to all that are priuately distressed, or afflicted, either in body or mind. Englished by Iohn Stradling, gentleman</i>	Lipsius, Justus	Stradling, John	boconstded	boconstpro

Appendix 2: Example paratext (troadespro)

ALthough (gentle Reader) thou mayst perhaps thinke me arrogant, for that I onely among so many fine wittes, and towardly youth, (with which England this day florisheth) haue enterprised to set forth in englishe, thys present piece, of the flowre of all writers Seneca, as who saye not fearing what grauer heddes might iudge of me, in atte{m}pting so harde a thyng, yet vpon me pondering what next ensueth, I trust both thy selfe shalt clere thyne owne suspicion, and thy chaunged opinion, shal iudge of me more rightfull sentence. For neyther haue I taken thys worke first in hand, as once ente{n}ding it shoulde come to light (of well doing whereof I vtterly dispayred) and being done but for mine owne priuate excercyse. I am in mine opinion herein blameles, thoughe I haue (to proue my selfe) pryuatly taken & part which pleased me best. of so excellent an auctor, for better is time spe{n}t in the best then other, and at first to attempt the hardest writers, shal make a man more prompt, to translate the easier with more facilitie. But now sins by request, and frendshyp of those, to whom I coulde deny nothing, this woorke against my will, extorted is out of my handes, I nedes must craue thy pacience in reading, and facilitie of iudgement: when thou shalt apara{n}tly see, my wi[t]les lacke of learning, praying the to consyder. how harde a thyng it is for me, to touche at full in all poyntes, the aucthoures minde, (being in many places very harde and doubtfull and the worke mucche corrupt by the defaute of euill printed bookes) and also how farre aboue my powre, to keepe that grace, and maiestye of style, that Seneca doth, when both so excellent a writer, hath past the reache of all imitation, and also thys our englishe toong (as many thinke and I here fynde) is farre vnable, to compare with the latten, but thou (good reader) if I in any place, haue swerued from the trew sence. or not kept the royaltie of speach, meete for a tragedy, impute the tone to my youth: and lack of iugement, the other to my lacke of eloquence. Now as concerning sondry places augmented and some altered in thys my translacion. Fyrst forasmuch as thys worke semed vnto me, in some places vnpersyite (whether left so of the authour or part of it lost as tyme deuoureth all thynges I wotte not) I haue (where I thought good,) wyth addicyon of mine owne pen, supplied the want of some thynges, as the fyrst Chorus, after the fyrst act beginning thus. O ye to whom &c. Also in the second acte. I haue added the speche

of Achilles spright, rying from hell to require the sacrifice of Polixena beginning in this wise. Forsaking now &c. Againe the three last staues of the Chorus after the same acte, and as for the third Chorus which in Seneca begynneth thus, Que vocat sedesi for as much, as nothing is therin but a heaped noumbre of farre & strange countreies, consydering with my selfe, y^t the names of so many vnknowne countreyes mountaines. desertes, and woodes should haue no grace in the englishe tonge, but be a straunge and vnpleasaunt thing to the readers, (except I should expounde the histories of eche one, which would be farre to tedious) I haue in the place therof, made a nother beginning in thys maner. O Ioue that leadst &c. whych alteracyon may be borne withall, seeing that the Corus is no part of the substance of the matter. In the rest I haue for my sclender learning, endeouored to kepe touche with the Latten, not woorde for woorde or verse for verse as to expounde it, but neglecting the placing of the wordes obserued their sence. Take gentle reader this in good worth, wyth all hys fautes fauour my first beginninges, and amende rather with good will, such thynges as herein are [a]mis, then to depraue or discommende my labour and paynes, for the fautes, seing that I haue herein, but onely made way to other that can farre better do thys or like, desyring them that as they can, so they woulde. Fare well ge{n}tle reader, & accept my good will.

Appendix 3: Example of paratext analysis (troadespro)

Item	J	A	Appraised	Notes
thou mayst perhaps thinke me arrogant, for that I onely among so many fine wittes, and towardly youth, (with which England this day florisheth) haue enterprised to set forth in englishe, thys present piece,	-evo		Translator	-evoJ through non-authorial J: <i>thou [...]thinke me arrogant</i>
the flowre of all writers Seneca,		+evo	Author	metaphor: <i>flowre</i>
not fearing what grauer heddes might iudge of me,	+evo	+evo	Translator	counter-expectation: <i>not fearing</i> double coding: J/A
I trust both thy selfe shalt clere thyne owne suspicion, and thy chaunged opinion, shal iudge of me more rightfull sentence.	+insc	+insc	Translator	coloring: more rightfull double coding: J/A
For neyther haue I taken thys worke first in hand, as once ente{n}ding it shoulde come to light (of well doing whereof I vtterly dispayred) and being done but for mine owne priuate excercyse.		-evo	Work	borderline case of inclusion in the study: evaluation purely evoked
I am in mine opinion herein blameles,	+insc	+insc	Translator	double coding: J/A
I haue (to proue my selfe) pryuatly taken & part which pleased me best.		+insc	Work	
so excellent an author,		+insc	Author	
better is time spe{n}t in the best then other		+insc	Author / Work	double coding: author / work
But now sins by request, and frendshyp of those, to whom I coulde deny nothing, this woorke against my will, extorted is out of my handes, I nedes must craue thy pacience in reading		-evo/ +evo	Traslator/ Work	double coding.: non-authorial +evoA of work: <i>demand for print</i> & -evoA of work: <i>meant for private use</i> & -evoA of translator
my wi[t]les lacke of learning,		-insc	Translator	
praying the to consyder. how harde a thyng it is for me, to touche at full in all poyntes, the aouthoures minde, (being in many places very harde and doubtfull		-evo	Translator	
		-insc/ -evo	Author/ Work	double coding: sentence structure suggests author is

the worke muche corrupt		-insc	Work	evaluated, although perhaps the work is meant here?
the defeaute of euill printed bookes)		-insc	Work	
also how farre aboue my powre, to keepe that grace, and maiestye of style, that Seneca doth,		-evo +insc/ +insc	Translator Author/ Work	double coding: overlap +inscA of author & work
so excellent a writer,	+evo		Author	
hath past the reache of all imitation,	-evo		Author	
if I in any place, haue swerued from the trew sence. or not kept the royaltie of speach, meete for a tragedy impute the tone to my youth: and lack of iugement, the other to my lacke of eloquence.		+insc	Translator / Work	double coding: –evoJ of Translator through counter-expectation: <i>not kept, lack of</i> & +inscA of Work.
Fyrst forasmuch as thys worke semed vnto me, in some places vnpersyite (whether left so of the authour or part of it lost as tyme deuoureth all thynges I wotte not		-insc	Work	
In the rest I haue for my sclender learning, endeouored to kepe touche with the Latten, not woorde for woorde or verse for verse as to expounde it, but neglecting the placing of the wordes obserued their sence.		-insc	Translator	
		+evo	Translator	
Take gentle reader this in good worth, wyth all hys fautes fauour my first begininges, and amende rather with good will, such thynges as herein are [a]mis		-insc	Work	
		-evo	Work	

Table modified using Martin and White (2005: 71).

Legend:

+ / -	positive / negative evaluation
insc / evo	inscribed / evoked evaluation
J / A	Judgment / Appreciation
?	Unable to categorize

Appendix 4: Finnish summary

1. Johdanto

Kirjapainotaidon kehittämisen myötä 1500-luvun Englannissa alkoi ripeästi edennyt kirjatutannon ja -teollisuuden aikakausi. Tämän aikakauden tunnusmerkkejä olivat esimerkiksi eri ammattikuntien synty, tuotantomäärien kasvu sekä uusien aatteiden ja ideoiden, kuten reformaation ja protestantismin leviäminen. Lisäksi kirjapainotaito vaikutti moniin muihin kulttuurisiin muutoksiin. Verrattain alhaiset kustannukset ja kasvavat painosmäärät mahdollistivat uusien tekstilajien ja tuotantotyyppien ilmestymisen aiemmin varsin suljetuille markkinoille. Lukutaito yleistyi, ja vanha, käsikirjoitustuotannon aikakaudelta peräisin oleva mesenaattiperinne alkoi väistyä uuden tuotantotavan tieltä (esim. Febvre ja Martin 2010: 262-332; Eisenstein [1979] 1980; Hellinga 2007: 211-212).

Tässä työssä tutkitaan asenteita kirjoja kohtaan 1500-luvun Britanniassa tarkastelemalla niitä koskevaa arvottavaa kieltä. Työn taustahypoteesina on, että kirjapainotaidon kasvattamat tuotantomäärät ja kirjojen yleistymisen olisivat herättäneet keskusteluja siitä, millainen on hyvä kirja. Kirjoihin kohdistuvat asenteet ovat ehkä parhaiten nähtävissä ns. *parateksteissä*. Genetten (1997) mukaan paratekstit ovat kirjojen oheistekstejä, kuten otsikoita, sisällysluetteloita ja esipuheita. Paratekstien tarkoitus on informoida tekstin potentiaalista lukijaa tekstin sisällöstä sekä tekstin hyväksyttävästä tulkinnasta. Tutkimuksessa käytetyt paratekstit ovat kääntäjien dedikaatioita ja esipuheita. Materiaalin rajauksessa tuottajan mukaan oli taustalla ajatus, jonka mukaan kääntäjä, tuottaessaan jo olemassa olevaa materiaalia, arvottaisi kirjaa perustellakseen ratkaisunsa. Työn tutkimuskysymykset ovat seuraavat:

1. Millä tavoin positiivista tai negatiivista arvotusta tuotetaan 1500-luvun kääntäjien parateksteissä?
2. Mitä nämä arvotukset paljastavat aikalaismielipiteistä kirjaa kohtaan?

Tutkimuksen kysymyksiin vastataan lähiluennan keinoin. Tutkimuksen materiaaliksi valittiin kuusitoista kääntäjän esipuhetta ja dedikaatiota 86 vastaavaa paratekstiä sisältävästä korpuksesta *Corpus of Sixteenth-Century Paratexts (CCP)*. Valituista parateksteistä poimittiin arvottavat ilmaukset, jotka analysoitiin ns. *Appraisal Framework* -mallin (AF) avulla. AF on puhujan tunteisiin ja mielipiteisiin keskittynyt, systemis-funktionaalisen kielitieteen perinteeseen kehitetty

leksikaalispainotteinen teoria (Martin [2000] 2001; Martin and White 2005; White 2001a).

2. Paratekstit

Lukijan tutustuesssa kirjaan tai tekstiin hänellä on mielikuva luettavan materiaalin luonteesta. Kirjan kannet ja ensi sivut sisältävät tekstejä joita selataan ennen lukemista. Näiden tekstien perusteella lukija muodostaa mielikuvan teoksesta ja päättää tekstin lukemisesta. Päätöksen pohjana toimivia tekstejä kutsutaan parateksteiksi.

Paratekstiteorian kehittänyt Gérard Genette (1997) jakaa paratekstit kahteen ryhmään: *peritekstit* ja *epitekstit*. Ryhmien erona on etäisyys paratekstien kohteena olevasta 'päätekstistä'. Peritekstit ovat esim. mainoksia, arvosteluja tai muita itse teoksesta irrallaan esiintyviä, päätekstiä käsitteleviä tekstejä. Epitekstit puolestaan sijaitsevat teoksen kansien sisällä tai sen ulkopinnoilla. Otsikot, nimet, esipuheet ja sisällysluettelot ovat epitekstejä. Molempien paratekstityyppien tärkeimpänä tehtävänä on antaa informaatiota ja siten toimia polkuna päätekstiin sekä varmistaa että lukija hyväksyy kirjan esittämät näkökulmat ja ajatukset (Genette 1997: 4-5, 197).

Tässä työssä tärkeimmät paratekstityypit ovat kääntäjien tuottamat dedikaatiot ja esipuheet. Näiden piirteet eroavat toisistaan merkittävästi riippuen siitä, sovelletaanko Genetten moderniin kirjallisuuteen keskittyvää määritelmää vai termien historiallisia genrepiirteitä. Genette (1997: 161-293) määrittelee esipuheen yleensä päätekstin alkuun sijoittuvaksi epitekstiksi, jonka tärkein funktio on ohjata päätekstin luentaa. Lisäksi esipuheella on useita muita funktioita, joista keskeisin tälle työlle lienee esipuheen funktio 'ukkosenjohdattimena' (*lightning rod*), joka ohjaa teokseen mahdollisesti kohdistuvaa kritiikkiä muualle vastaamalla etukäteen mahdollisiin syytöksiin. Dedikaatio puolestaan on kaikessa yksinkertaisuudessaan teksti, joka nimeää tekstin vastaanottajan (Genette 1997: 135-136). Aikakauden kontekstissa paratekstityyppien funktiot eivät ole yhtä yksiselitteiset. Teemoiltaan tekstit saattoivat olla päällekkäiset eikä monia suoraviivaisia sääntöjä sisällöistä ollut. Paratekstien tärkein ominaisuus 1500-luvun kontekstissa on yhä ohjata luentaa, mutta Genetten määrittämä funktio esipuheen toimimisesta ukkosenjohdattimena on

tyypillinen dedikaatioissa, ei esipuheissa. Toinen keskeinen ero Genetten määritelmien ja 1500-luvun Britanniassa sovellettujen sisältöjen välillä koskee dedikaatioiden tärkeintä sisältöä: vastaanottajan nimeämistä. Aikakauden kontekstissa dedikaatio oli tärkeä prosessi, jonka tarkoitus oli saada mahdolliselta mesenaatilta rahallinen korvaus tai jokin muu huomionosoitus. Ilmankin tätä konkreettista korvausta dedikaatiossa esiintyvä nimi antoi teokselle lisäarvoa ja hillitsi mahdollista kritiikkiä teosta kohtaan. Muilta sisällöllisiltä elementeiltaan tutkitut epitekstit ovat varsin suoraviivaisia. Tyypillisesti niissä käsitellään dedikaatiota, päätekstiä ja kirjailijaa, kääntäjää ja käännöstä, yleisöä sekä joitain muita aiheita kuten rukouksia tai allekirjoituksia (Hiltunen 2012). Tavallisin ero dedikaation ja esipuheen välillä on varsinainen omistus, sillä muut Genetten määrittämistä sisältöeroista eivät ole yhtä näkyviä.

Ne historialliset seikat, jotka vaikuttivat 1500-luvun paratekstien tuotantoprosessiin sekä niiden eroihin moderneista parateksteistä, ovat moninaiset. Tekstien sisältöön ja teemoihin vaikuttavista historiallisista, kontekstualisoivista elementeistä kannattanee nostaa esiin kirjan tuotantoprosessin muutos, englannin kielen asema, sekä käännösprosessin murros. Ennen kirjapainotaidon saapumista Englantiin kääntäjä yritti hankkia työnsä mesenaatin, jolle kirja omistettiin. Kirjapainotaidon myötä mesenaatin paikan kirjatutannon taloudellisessa prosessissa vei pikkuhiljaa suurempi yleisö, ja siksi 1500-luvun epiteksteissä mesenaatille osoitettu dedikaatio kulkee rinta rinnan muille lukijoille tarkoitetun esipuheen kanssa (Enenkel 2008: 39). Tästä syystä myös sisällöt ovat teksteissä osittain päällekkäiset.

Toinen tutkimuksen tekstityyppejä kontekstualisoiva seikka on englannin kielen asema. Iso-Britannian painotalojen ollessa lapsenkengissään Manner-Euroopasta saapuvat latinan- ja ranskankieliset tekstit ylittivät paikallisten painajien laadullisen kilpailukyvyn (Shaw 2007: 221). Markkina-asemaa luodakseen Lontoon painotalot keskittyivät englanninkielisiin teksteihin (*ibid.*: 221-222). Englannin kielen alhainen status alkoi parantua vuosisadan kuluessa, humanismin ja reformaation levitessä Britanniaan. Seurauksena osassa tutkituista parateksteistä esiintyy merkittävä konflikti teoksen kääntämisen ja käännöstyön arvon sekä englannin kielen vähempiarvoisuuden välillä (Rhodes 2011).

Kolmas ja viimeinen tekstityyppiä kontekstualisoiva seikka liittyykin kääntämiseen. Asenteet kääntämistä ja käännöstyötä kohtaan olivat murroksessa 1500-luvun Britanniassa. Monet CCP- parateksteistä kommentoivat uuden ja vanhan käännöstekniikan eroja, verraten vanhaa ”sana sanasta” -käännöstekniikkaa uuteen sisältöihin ja tyyliin keskittyvään (1985: 104-112, 123; Morini 2006: 5).

Nämä kolme paratekstejä kontekstualisoivaa seikkaa (tuotantoprosessin muutos, englannin kielen asema, käännösprosessin muutos) nousevat yleensä esiin parateksteissä nöyryyden ja vaatimattomuuden diskurssien kautta (*modesty topos*, MT). Tämä 1500-luvun parateksteissä tyypillinen temaattinen elementti on peräisin antiikista, jossa se kuvasi tapaa avata puheenvuoro vaatimattomasti, jotta puhuja saisi kuulijansa sympatian puolelleen (Curtius 1990: 83-85; Janson 1964). 1500-luvun kontekstissa merkitys on kärjistynyt tarkoittamaan oman itsen ja omien tuotosten suorastaan nöyristelevää esittämistapaa sekä dedikaatiossa mainitun mesenaatin avointa mielistelyä.

3. Teoreettinen viitekehys

Tämä työ tutkii kirjoihin kohdistuvaa arvottavaa kieltä soveltaen Whiten (2001a; 2001b; 2001c; etc.) sekä Martinin ja Whiten (2005) kehittämää Appraisal Framework -mallia (AF). Teoria tarjoaa viitekehysten, jonka varassa tarkastella puhujan tai kirjoittajan tapaa esittää mielipiteitä ja tunteita monologisissa teksteissä sekä keinoja vaikuttaa kuulijaan tai lukijaan, jotta tämä hyväksyisi tekstissä esitetyt mielipiteet (Martin ja White 2005: 1).

AF on osa *systeemis-funktionaalisen lingvistiikan* (SFL) tutkimusperinnettä, joka lähestyy kieltä sen sosiaalisen ja intersubjektin luonteen kautta (Halliday 1981: 14-15). Arvottavan kielen tutkimus SFL:n piirissä on ollut viime vuosina aktiivista, vaikka terminologia ja tutkimuksen näkökulmat eivät ole vielä vakiintuneet. Tutkimuskenttään kuuluu esimerkiksi tunteiden, asenteiden, mielipiteiden ja konnotaatioiden tutkimisesta (esim. Bednarek 2006b; Hunston [1994] 2005). Osana tätä tutkimuskenttää AF:n etuna on sen leksikaalinen lähestymistapa, jonka ansiosta on mahdollista tutkia myös mielipiteiden ja asenteiden epäsuoria ilmenemismuotoja (Bednarek 2006b).

White (2001a) jakaa viitekehyksen piirissä tutkittavat elementit kolmeen luokkaan. *asenne* (*Attitude*), *voima* (*Graduation*) ja puhujan *sitoutuminen* (*Engagement*) viestiin. Näistä kolmesta tälle tutkimukselle tärkein on ensimmäinen, asenne, joka määrittää, voiko ilmausta tarkastella arvottavana. Muut elementit (voima ja sitoutumien) auttavat ilmauksen tarkemmassa analyysissä.

Asenne jaetaan kolmeen alakategoriaan (esim. Martin ja White 2005: 45-52; White 2001a; White 2001c). Ensimmäinen, *tunne* (*Affect*) kuvaa esineitä, asioita tai ihmisiä puhujan emotionaalisen reaktion kautta (*Ahdistun kuunnelllessani republikaanien puoluekokousta.*). Toinen, *tuomitseminen* (*Judgment*), keskittyy arvottamaan ihmisen persoonaa tai tämän toimia (*Hän on hyvä esimerkki nuoremmilleen.*). Viimeinen alakategoria on tälle tutkimukselle keskeisin. *Arvostus* (*Appreciation*) soveltaa estetiikan kautta muodostuvia subjektiivisia kokemuksia taustana arvottavalle ilmaukselle (*Onpa kaunis taulu. Se oli hyvä kirja.*). Arvostuksen kohteena on tyypillisesti fyysinen objekti, mutta myös ihmistä voi arvottaa arvostuksen kautta, mikäli henkilöä kuvataan objektina tai entiteettinä (*Espanjalaiset kirjailijat ovat taitavia.*). Kaikki arvottavat ilmaukset analysoidaan pääasiassa positiivinen /negatiivinen -aspektilla, vaikka useita muitakin sisällön tyyppiä tarkentavia kuvauksen keinoja olisi AF:ssä tarjolla.

White (2001a: 2001c) on jakanut asennetta ilmaisevat arvottavat ilmaukset puhujan tai kirjoittajan asennetta ilmaiseviin sekä kolmannen osapuolen asennetta raportoiviin. Tämän tutkimuksen aineistoksi kuitenkin hyväksyttiin vain kirjoittajan asennetta ilmaisevat arvottavat ilmaukset, sillä raportoidun asenteen katsotaan olevan epäluotettava tiedonlähde.

Asenne on myös karkeasti jaettu implisiittisiin ja eksplisiittisiin ilmauksiin (Martin ja White 2005: 61-68; White 2001a). Eksplisiittisissä ilmauksissa, kuten *Hän laiminlyö lapsiaan* (tuomitseminen) arvotus käy ilmi yhdestä sanasta tai ilmauksesta (*laiminlyö*), jonka keskeisin merkitys on määritelmällisesti negatiivinen puhujan taustasta tai kulttuurisesta kontekstista riippumatta (White 2001a). Implisiittisissä ilmauksissa puolestaan on oleellista nimenomaan tämä tilanteellinen ja kulttuurinen konteksti, joka mahdollistaa ilmauksen viestin välittymisen. Esimerkiksi ilmaus *Hän käy kokopäivätoimissa* ei sisällä eksplisiittisen arvottavia elementtejä eikä sitä

länsimaistuneissa yhteiskunnissa tulkittaisi negatiiviseksi tuomioksi henkilöstä. Joissakin yhteiskunnissa tämä on kuitenkin mahdollista.

Implisiittisen asenteen tunnistamiseksi Martin ja White (2005: 62-63) tarjoavat erilaisia keinoja, joista oleelliset tälle tutkimukselle ovat tekstin *värittäminen* (*coloring*) tai viestin *merkitseminen* (*sign-posting*). Värittäminen on prosessi, jossa asettamalla eksplisiittisen positiivinen arvottava ilmaus esimerkiksi ennen implisiittistä kirjoittaja viestii lukijalle, miten implisiittinen arvotus tulisi tulkita. Merkitseminen puolestaan tapahtuu useilla eri välineillä, joista tärkein tämän tutkimuksen kontekstissa on eräänlainen *muutosindikaattori* (*counter-expectancy indicator*), joka viestii asenne-ilmaisun sisältämän asenteen olevan vastakkainen edellisen lauseen asenteeseen nähden (*Hän puhui kauniisti, mutta en vakuuttunut*) (White 2001d).

Lopuksi on huomattava, että vaikka lukija tunnistaisi asenne-ilmauksen, hän ei välttämättä hyväksy sitä (Martin 1995: 33). Tämä on tyypillistä esimerkiksi erilaisista sosio-ekonomisista taustoista peräisin olevien ihmisten välisessä diskurssissa. Vaikka kuulija ymmärtäisi kontekstista että lauseen *Hän käy kokopäivätyössä* merkitys on tarkoitettu samaksi kuin lauseen *Hän laiminlyö lapsiaan*, kuulijan on mahdollista kieltäytyä hyväksymästä lauseita samanarvoisiksi. Lisäksi on tietenkin mahdollista että kuulija kyseenalaistaa väitteen totuudenmukaisuuden.

4. Tutkimusmateriaalit ja -menetelmät

Materiaalina työssäni käytin kuuttatoista kääntäjän tuottamaa paratekstiä, jotka on valittu korpuksesta *Corpus of Sixteenth-Century Paratexts* (2012), jossa on yhteensä 86 kääntäjien tuottamaa dedikaatiota, esipuhetta ja jälkikirjoitusta. Korpuksen paratekstit on puolestaan koottu Internet-tietokannasta *Early English Books Online* (EEBO), jonka jälkeen ne koodattiin XML-muotoon *WordSmith Tools* -korpusohjelmassa käytettäväksi.

CCP:stä valittiin kymmenen nimekettä, yksi joka vuosikymmenelle. Nimekkeet sisälsivät yhteensä kuusitoista kääntäjien esipuhetta ja dedikaatiota. CCP:n

yksittäisille parateksteille antamat lyhytnimet toimivat myös pääasiallisena viittausmetodinä tässä tutkimuksessa. Alla tutkimusmateriaali on taulukoituna:

Lyhytnimeke	Julk.	Nimeke	STC	Kääntäjä	Pituus
lyfsaint pro	1500	Lyf of saint katherin	24766	n/a	620
olycasty ded	1518	[Here endeth ye hystorye of Olyuer of Castylle, and of the fayre Helayne]	18808	Watson, Henry	180
bokdisty pro	1528	The vertuose boke of distyllacyon	13436	Andrew, Laurence	360
mortmand ded	1534	Mortalitie of man	6157	Eliot, Thomas	480
mortman pro		The rules of a christian lyfe			380
apophth pro	1542	Apophthegmes	10443	Udall, Nicholas	1350
troad ded	1559	Troades	22227a	Heywood, Jasper	500
troad pro					720
oedipus ded	1563	Oedipus	22225	Neville, Alexander	820
oedipus pro					470
survvorl ded	1572	The surueye of the vvorld	6901	Twyne, Thomas	410
survvorl pro					420
palengl ded	1588	The famous, pleasant, and variable historie, of Palladine of England	5541	Monday, Anthony	310
palengl pro					190
boconst ded	1595	Tvvo bookes of constancie	15695	Stradling, John	510
boconst pro					1040

Taulukko 1. Tutkimusmateriaali.

Taulukosta 1 käy ilmi materiaalin tarkemmat julkaisutiedot, kuten nimeke, julkaisu-vuosi, paratekstin pituus, kääntäjä ja STC-numero (Short Title Catalogue number) tekstin tunnistamista varten. Lyhytnimekkeen lopun kolme viimeistä numeroa kerto-vat, onko kyseessä dedikaatio (**dedication**) vai esipuhe (**prologue**).

Materiaalia lähestyttiin lähiluennan keinoin. Arvottavat ilmaukset merkittiin teks-teissä ja jaoteltiin AF:n mukaisesti kategorioihin. Materiaaliksi hyväksyttävien arvottavien ilmausten tuli kohdistua joko kirjaan itseensä, johonkin kirjan piirteeseen, tai kirjan tuotannossa toimineeseen henkilöön, kuten kääntäjään tai kirjailijaan (Bednarek 2009). Ainoastaan henkilöitä tuomitsevat sekä henkilöitä ja objekteja arvostavat ilmaukset hyväksyttiin primäärimateriaaliksi, sillä tunteeseen perustuvat arvotukset olivat harvinaisia ja kuvasivat usein raportoituja tilanteita. Primäärিতেistä löydetyt arvottavat ilmaukset merkittiin siis tuomitsevaksi/

arvostaviksi (Judgment/ Appreciation), implisiittisiksi/ eksplisiittiseksi (evoked/ inscribed) tai positiiviseksi/ negatiiviseksi seuraten Whiteä (2001a) ja Martinia ja Whiteä (2005: 71). Tämän jälkeen materiaalista alettiin etsiä lainalaisuuksia.

Lopuksi lienee mainittava että historiallisen materiaalin analyysissä, etenkin implisiittisten esiintymien kohdalla, on huomioitava historiallinen ja kulttuurinen etäisyys tutkittavasta tekstistä ja sen kirjoittajasta. Tämän etäisyyden takia osa esiintymistä on tutkimuksen ulkopuolella.

5. Analyysi ja tulokset

Tämän kappaleen tarkoituksena on kategorisoida ja analysoida tutkimuskohteena olevissa parateksteissä esiintyvää arvottavaa kieltä sekä pohtia analyysin tuloksia ja niiden implikaatioita. Kappale etenee siten, että ensin käsitellään kirjaa suoraan koskevat arvotukset, minkä jälkeen siirrytään analysoimaan kirjoittajaa ja kääntäjää koskevia ilmauksia. Molemmissa kohdissa on tarkoitus edetä ilmausten temaattisia elementtejä ja sisällöllisiä yhtäläisyyksiä seuraten yksinkertaisimmista monimutkaisimpiin.

Kirjaa suoraan arvottavat ilmaukset keskittyvät yleensä yhteen kolmesta seuraavasta aiheesta: pääteksti kokonaisuutena, kirjan yksittäiset piirteet tai käännös. Kirjaa sen valmistamiseen osallistuneiden toimijoiden kautta arvottavat ilmaukset keskittyvät puolestaan kääntäjän ja kirjoittajan tuomitsemiseen tai arvostukseen.

Päätekstiä kokonaisuutena arvostavat ilmaukset on usein muotoiltu niin, että arvottava ilmaus näyttää kohdistuvan koko kirjaan. Tosiasiassa lauserakenne paljastaa, että ilmauksessa arvotetaan pelkkää päätekstiä. Nämä ilmaukset voivat olla implisiittisiä tai eksplisiittisiä, mutta arvostus on aina positiivisesti sävyttynyttä. Tyypillinen ilmaus (*noble worke*, survvorldded: 2v; *excellent booke* boconstded: 2r) on abstraktin positiivinen laadun ilmaus, joka ei kuitenkaan kerro juuri mitään arvotuksen perusteista.

Kirjan yksittäisiä piirteitä arvottavat ilmaukset ovat huomattavasti paljastavampia. Nämä ilmaukset keskittyvät useimmiten kirjan aiheen tai sisällön, kirjan luennasta saatavan hyödyn tai teoksen tyylin arvottamiseen. Kirjan sisällön arvottaminen on useimmiten eksplisiittisen positiivista, joskin joitain eksplisiittisen negatiivisiakin

ilmauksia esiintyy epitekstuaalisissa konteksteissa. Käytännössä teoksen sisältöä voi arvottaa positiivisesti miltei minkä tahansa seikan perusteella. Materiaalissa tyypillisiä olivat eksplisiittisen positiiviset arvotukset sisällön moraalisuuden, hurskauden tai aiheen yleisen korkealaatuisuuden vuoksi (*notable Subiette*, boconstded: 2r; *high poinctes of cousaill [...] treasure of morall doctrine*, apophthpro: 2r). Negatiiviset arvotukset kirjan sisällöstä olivat erittäin harvinaisia. Kaikki materiaalista löydetty negatiiviset ilmaukset olivat epitekstuaalisia, eli ne arvottivat jotain muuta kuin käsillä olevaa teosta (*phantasticall trifles*, apophthpro: 3r). Kirjan luennasta saatavan hyödyn arvottaminen suoritettiin myös eksplisiittisesti. Kirjaa arvotettiin useimmiten hyödyllisenä tai nautintoa tuottavana kokemuksena (*profitable, plesauante*, apophthpro: 2r). Negatiivisia vaikutuksia luennalle ei mainittu. Viimeisenä ja kulttuurisesta kontekstistaan riippuvaisimpana kirjan sisällön arvotuksena mainittakoon tyyli. Kirjaa arvottavissa ilmauksissa tyylistä puhutaan eksplisiittisen positiivisesti, suorastaan ylistävään sävyyn (*grace, and majesty of style*, troadespro: 4r; *verely elegante*, mortmanded: 3r; *lofty Style*, oedipusded: 2r). On kuitenkin jälleen huomattava, että nämä eksplisiittisen positiiviset ilmaukset arvottavat teoksen päätekstiä, eivät käännöstä. Kirjan tyyli ymmärrettiin 1600-luvun Britanniassa kirjan kielen kautta: latinan- tai ranskankielistä teosta oli sopivaa evaluoida tyylliseikoista positiivisesti, englanninkielistä ei. Aiheeseen palataan alla käännöksen arvottamisen yhteydessä.

Käännöksen arvottaminen tapahtui 1600-luvun parateksteissä erillään kirjaa arvottavista ilmauksista. Pääsääntöisesti käännöstä arvottavat ilmaukset voi jakaa kahteen kategoriaan: positiivisiin ja negatiivisiin. Negatiivisesti käännöstä arvottavat ilmaukset ovat useimmiten eksplisiittisiä ja käyttävät lyhyitä, usein toistuvia adjektiiveja kuten *base, rude, simple* ja *little* (e.g. *oedipuspro: 6v; bokdistypro: 2r; troadesded: 3r*). Selkeimmin negatiivisesti arvottavissa ilmauksissa on usein edellään deiktinen ilmaus, kuten *my* tai *this*, tarkentamassa lauseen kontekstisidonnaisuutta ja ohjaamassa kritiikin nimenomaan kohti käännöstä (e.g. *my base tra{n}slated Tragedie*, *oedipuspro: 6v*). Lekseemit *simple* ja *little* puolestaan ovat verrattain implisiittisiä. Nämä adjektiivit ovat tavallisimmin käytetyt kirjan kuvailun sanat materiaalissa. Molempien sanakirjamerkitykset tarjoavat ilmauksille sekä negatiivisia että positiivisia sisältöjä, ja sanat esiintyvät sekä positiivisen että negatiivisen diskurssin värittä-

missä ympäristöissä. Lisäksi sanojen käyttötiheys ja vahvan kollokaation deiktiset ilmaukset viittaavat siihen, että sanojen tarkka merkitys on riippuvainen paitsi kulttuurisesta kontekstista, myös genreveatimuksista. Lopulta todettiin, että vaikka *simple* ja *little* voivat merkitä lievästi negatiivisia arvotuksia, on todennäköisempää, että aikalaisympäristössä ilmausten olisi tulkittu ilmentävän kirjoittajansa koulutus- taustaa ja lukeneisuutta, sekä tietämystä paratekstin genreveatimuksista.

Käännöksen positiivinen arvottaminen tapahtui yleensä implisiittisten ilmausten kautta. Tässä yleensä toistuu kolme perusteemaa: motivaatio käännökseen, käännös- prosessi ja mesenaatti. Yksinkertaisin näistä lienee ensimmäinen. Ajoittain parateks- teissä mainitaan, että valmiin käännöstyön julkaisupäätös tehtiin ystävien, sukulais- ten tai mesenaatin pyynnöstä tai painostuksen alaisena. Tämä implikoi selkeää positiivista arvotusta käännöstyölle, etenkin koska väite usein esitetään itseä tai käännöstä koskevan eksplisiittisen negatiivisen arvotuksen jälkeen. Lauseiden väliä merkitään muutosindikaattorilla: *I to no other ende remoued hym from his naturall and loftye Style to our corrupt & base, [...] but onely to satisfye the instant requestes of a fewe my familiar frendes* (oedipusded: 2r-2v). Toinen tavallisesti implisiittien positiivisten arvotuksien kautta ilmaistu teema parateksteissä on itse käännöstyö. Samoin kuin edellisessä, implisiittiiseen positiiviseen arvotukseen kuuluu negatiivi- nen arvotus koskien omaa työtä tai itseä, muutosindikaattori ja positiiviseen arvotus lauseen lopussa: *from his Author in worde and Uerse far transformed, though in Sense lytell altred* (oedipuspro: 6v). Kolmas käännöksen positiivista arvotusta impli- koiva teema on mesenaatin nimeäminen ja tämän nimen käyttäminen tuottamaan toistuvia positiivisia implikaatioita tekstistä. Muiden toimijoiden arvottaminen ja tuomitseminen käsitellään erikseen, mutta mesenaatin tuomitseminen tai arvottami- nen ei ole itse teoksen arvottamisen kannalta yhtä olennaista kuin mesenaatin nimeäminen. Tämä johtuu tekstien kulttuurisesta kontekstista ja kirjatutannon histo- riasta. Ääriesimerkkinä voisi käyttää Heywoodin dedikaatiota kuningatar Elizabethille (troadesded). Mesenaatti oli aina korkeammassa sosioekonomisessa asemassa kuin paratekstin kirjoittaja. Ottaen huomioon painoarvon, jota kuningattaren nimi ja arvonimi kantoivat aikalaisyhteiskunnassa, lienee turvallista olettaa ettei Heywood olisi omistanut kuningattarelle huonona pitämäänsä käännöstä,

vaikkei kuningatar itse olisi mesenaatiksi suostunutkaan. Siksi pelkkä mesenaatin nimeäminen viestii epäsuorasti positiivista arvotusta käännöksestä.

Tähän asti tässä kappaleessa on käsitelty kirjojen arvostusta (Appreciation) suoraan kirjoja arvottavia (Appraisal) ilmauksia tarkastelemalla. Kirjoja kohtaan kuitenkin ilmaistiin asenteita myös kirjailijoita ja kääntäjiä arvottamalla. Toisin kuin ne kirjoja arvottavat ilmaukset, joita tuotettiin vain arvostelun kautta, kirjoissa esiintyviä toimijoita arvotettiin käyttäen sekä arvostelua että tuomitsemista (Judgment). Muilta osin kääntäjän ja käännöksen sekä kirjailijan ja päätekstin arvotukset vastaavat jokseenkin toisiaan.

Kirjan alkuperäistä kirjoittajaa arvotettiin parateksteissä yksiselitteisen positiivisesti. Arvottava ilmaus saattoi olla eksplisiittisen positiivinen arvostus, kuten *best* (troadespro: 3v) tai yhtä eksplisiittinen positiivinen tuomio auktorin luonteesta kuten *grace and vertues* (mortmanded: 4r). Keskeistä näille arvottaville ilmauksille on se, että ne kaikki kuvaavat kirjailijaa positiivisessa valossa. Toinen huomionarvoinen seikka kirjailijan arvotuksessa on, että vaikka arvotusta tapahtuu monen eri kommunikaatiostrategian kautta, mukaan lukien implisiittisiä ja eksplisiittisiä arvostusta ja tuomioita, tyypillisimmät arvottavat ilmaukset ovat miltei tyhjää retoriikkaa sisältäviä abstrakteja laatua koskevia kannanottoja, kuten *excellent* (e.g. troadespro: 3v).

Kääntäjän arvotukset ovat hieman monimutkaisempia analyysin kohteita. Tavallisin kääntäjää arvottava ilmaus on eksplisiittinen negatiivinen arvostus joka kohdistuu kääntäjän ammattitaitoon (e.g. *my lytell and obscure vnderstandynge*, olycastyded: 6r). Nämä eksplisiittiset negatiivisen arvostuksen ilmaukset selittyvät paratekstien genreveatimuksilla: nöyryyden diskurssi saneli kääntäjän asenteen omaa työtään kohtaan. On huomionarvoista, että vastaavissa kääntäjää negatiivisesti arvottavissa ilmauksissa negatiivisen arvostuksen eksakti kohde on kääntäjän ammattitaito. Kääntäjän ahkeruutta sen sijaan sai arvottaa positiivisessa valossa: *I haue bee{n} so bolde with myne autour, as to make the firste booke & secounde, whiche he maketh thirde and fourth[.] Yet [...] I haue labou[r]ed to discharge the duetie of a translator* (apothpro: 2r). Esimerkistä alleviivatun osan tunnistaa implisiittiseksi arvotukseksi lausetta edeltävästä muutosindikaattorista. Koska lauseen alku (*I haue bee{n} so*

bolde) sisältää negatiivisen tuomion kääntäjän ammattitaidosta, muutosindikaattori viestii seuraavan arvottavan ilmauksen positiivisuutta. Lopuksi mainittakoon että kääntäjän luonnetta koskevat tuomitsevat arvotukset liittyivät kääntäjän uskonnollisuuteen, samoin kuin kirjailijaakin koskevat arvotukset.

Yhteenvetona analyysille voisi todeta, että vaikka 1500-luvun kirjoja, kirjailijoita ja kääntäjiä koskeva arvottava kieli on erittäin vaihtelevaa, siinä esiintyy säännönmukaisuuksia, joista voi päätellä aikalaisten mielipiteitä siitä, millainen on hyvä kirja. Hyvällä kirjalla tuli olla erinomainen (tai muuten abstraktilla tavalla arvotettu) auktori, mahdollisimman tunnettu mesenaatti ja vaatimaton kääntäjä (joskin kääntäjä sai olla ahkera tai tunnollinen, kunhan asia esitettiin negatiivisen arvotuksen kontekstissa). Ainoastaan kääntäjää sopi arvottaa negatiivisesti, joskin kääntäjän kohdalla se oli suorastaan pakollista. Kirjan itse tuli olla tyyliältään korkealentoinen, aiheeltaan ylevä ja tuottaa lukijalle joko mielihyvää tai tiedollista hyötyä.

6. Lopuksi

Tässä työssä on tutkittu kirjan arvotusta 1500-luvun Britanniassa käyttäen materiaalina kuuttatoista kääntäjän paratekstiä. Evaluoivaa kieltä tutkittiin tunteiden ja mielipiteiden lingvististen representaatioiden analysointia varten suunnitellun Appraisal Framework-mallin kautta. Tutkimuksessa todettiin teorian tarjoamien mahdollisuuksien tuottavan eriomaisen, joskin työläästi koottavan yleiskatsauksen arvottavaan kieleen. AF:n etuna oli sen leksikaalinen lähestymistapa, joka mahdollisti implisiittisten arvotusten analyysin.

Tutkimuksen tuloksista yleistettävien lienee, että summittaisella positiivisuuden ja negatiivisuuden skaalalla kirjaa ja kirjailijaa koskevat arvotukset ovat tyypillisemmin eksplisiittisen positiivisia, kun taas käännöstä ja kääntäjää koskevat arvottavat ilmaukset ovat tavallisesti joko eksplisiittisen negatiivisia tai implisiittisen positiivisia. Positiiviset ilmaukset eivät kuitenkaan materiaalissa koskaan kohdistu kääntäjän taitoihin, vaan ennemmin tämän toimiiin käännöstyön parissa.